

Around this casket all bitterness dies as we bear our tearful tribute to American manhood and American statesmanship.

Those who differed with him most were quick and glad to recognize his great learning, wide experience, splendid courage, and absolute honesty.

These high qualities of character commanded the admiration and loyalty of his constituency at home and an acknowledged position among his colleagues here. If from this sad place the message may go to the young men of our Nation that character and service are the conditions of place and permanency in public life, our friend and brother will have added yet another contribution to the life of the country he loved and served so long and well.

Mr. PAYNE was a man of deep religious convictions. Reared in a Christian home, uniting early with the church, called to its activities, he soon became recognized as a devoted and efficient leader. He gave generously of his time, his means, and his influence.

On coming to this city he immediately identified himself with a church of his own denomination, and few were more regular or loyal attendants on its public services. On many occasions he there bore tender and eloquent testimony to his Christian faith.

It was but natural that at last he should be found with the open Bible beside him. The noble and devoted wife had passed to her reward three years ago, the son was in another city, no kin were near when that last hour came on, but the One Book that had so long been a light to his pathway was beside him as he entered the valley and the shadow of death.

At the end of a long and honored career he rests from his labors in the blessed hope of the resurrection and the life everlasting. In this distinguished presence we pay this grateful tribute to his memory, and pray that the God of all grace may comfort this sorrowing family and the many whose hearts are heavy with sense of great and personal loss.

So live, that when thy summons comes to join  
The innumerable caravan that moves  
To that mysterious realm where each shall take  
His chamber in the silent halls of death,  
Thou go not, like the quarry slave at night,  
Scourged to his dungeon, but sustained and soothed  
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave  
Like one that wraps the drapery of his couch  
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

The choir sang "Lead, Kindly Light."

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., pronounced the following benediction:

And now, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, sanctify our hearts by this service, and let the spirit which has come into them lead us all the journey of life, and at last bring us to Thee; in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, our Savior. Amen.

The members of the President's Cabinet, the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Ambassadors to the United States and the Diplomatic Corps, the Senate, and the committee appointed on the part of the Senate and House to escort the remains withdrew from the Chamber in the order named.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes a. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, December 14, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

### SENATE.

Monday, December 14, 1914.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come before Thee, Almighty God, that we may enter into communion and fellowship with the Lord God Almighty. We remember that justice and judgment are the habitation of Thy throne. Thou hast set an exceeding high standard of life, but Thy grace is sufficient for every duty that confronts us. We pray Thee to speak to us. Speak through the precious memories of our own innocent childhood. Speak to us through the pressing call of the world about us and the various language of nature. Speak to us by Thy grace in our hearts and through Thy word, that we may know the divine will and may have the purpose of heart to execute all that Thou dost require at our hands. For Christ's sake. Amen.

WILLIAM E. CHILTON, a Senator from the State of West Virginia; MOSES E. CLAPP, a Senator from the State of Minnesota; LUKE LEA, a Senator from the State of Tennessee; CHARLES E. TOWNSEND, a Senator from the State of Michigan; and THOMAS B. CATRON, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

#### WAR SUPPLIES TO BELLIGERENT NATIONS.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, at this point I wish merely to call the attention of the Chair and of the Senate to the reference of the bill (S. 6862) to forbid the furnishing of war materials to belligerent nations, introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] on the 10th instant. The bill was by the Chair referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I am not going to ask that any change of reference be made at this moment when the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] or the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], who is chairman of the committee, are not present, both of whom seem to be absent now; but clearly the bill should have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A similar bill, introduced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], relating to almost identically the same subject matter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and properly so referred. The reference to the Committee on Military Affairs was evidently an oversight, or it was probably marked on the bill when it was introduced by the Senator from California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was a request on the part of the Senator from California that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and, there being no objection, it was so referred.

Mr. STONE. Then, of course, that reference naturally followed in the absence of objection, but now we have two bills relating to the same subject pending before two separate committees, and the matter covered by each of the bills relates to subjects that almost exclusively affect our relations with foreign countries. There is no more reason for sending such a bill to the Committee on Military Affairs than to the Committee on Naval Affairs or the Committee on Public Lands. It is a matter which belongs to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations. For that reason, as well as to prevent confusion in having the same subject matter considered by two committees, I am going to ask, when the Senators interested are present, that the reference be changed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN subsequently said: Mr. President, some days ago the junior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] introduced a bill (S. 6862) to forbid the furnishing of war materials to belligerent nations. It was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, although I think it ought to have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I therefore ask that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES (H. DOC. NO. 1350).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, which will be read.

The Secretary read the communication, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, December 10, 1914.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I beg to transmit herewith an official copy of a resolution of both houses of the Philippine Legislature, received in the last mail from Manila, expressing appreciation and satisfaction to the House of Representatives for the passage of the Jones bill and requesting approval thereof by the President and Senate.

Very respectfully,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,  
Secretary of War.

[Third Philippine Legislature, third session.]

Resolution of both houses of the legislature in joint session assembled expressing their high appreciation to the House of Representatives of the United States for the passage of the Jones bill and requesting the same approval thereof by the President and Senate.

The Philippine Commission and Philippine Assembly, in joint session assembled in the marble hall of the Ayuntamiento, have

Resolved, That they express their highest appreciation and satisfaction to the House of Representatives of the United States for the favorable action taken in the matter of the Jones bill, notwithstanding the difficulties encountered, and that they earnestly request the Presi-

dent and Senate of said Nation to likewise approve said bill, so that, in extending the powers of government confided to the Filipinos and in opening up new paths to their national liberty, the Filipino people may be in condition to work out their own welfare and prosperity and may in every other respect be responsible for their own destinies;

And resolved further, That the honorable the Governor General be, and he hereby is, requested to transmit this message by cable to the United States.

Adopted October 16, 1914.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted by both houses of the legislature sitting in joint session on October 16, 1914.

GEORGE L. LOGAN,  
Secretary Philippine Commission.  
TEODORO M. KALAW,  
Secretary Philippine Assembly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication and accompanying paper will be referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

AMERICAN VESSELS AND WATCH OFFICERS (S. DOC. NO. 640).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, in further response to a resolution of October 16, 1914, a list of foreign-built vessels admitted to American registry under the act of August 18, 1914, together with certain information relative to the construction, ownership, and licensed officers on such vessels, and also a partial list of licensed officers for ocean steamers now out of employment and which are available for employment.

Mr. REED. Will the communication just submitted be printed in the RECORD?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The communication referred to is as follows:

#### AMERICAN VESSELS AND WATCH OFFICERS.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, December 12, 1914.

SIR: The department received on October 17 the following resolution of the Senate of the United States:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,  
October 8 (calendar day, October 16), 1914.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce be requested to furnish to the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interests, the following information:

First. How many Americans were shown by reports from the various customs districts to be available for watch officers, including masters, mates, and engineers, when the order suspending the requirements of the navigation laws relating thereto for a period of seven years was issued.

Second. A list of the vessels admitted to American registry under the emergency act, with a statement as to where and when built, by whom owned, what flag heretofore flying, and the number of American vessels and watch officers employed.

Attest: JAMES M. BAKER, Secretary.

Supplementing the partial compliance with this request on October 20, I now transmit:

1. Copies of replies from collectors of customs to the following inquiry of the department:

AUGUST 7, 1914.

Collector of Customs, \_\_\_\_\_:

Notify press your district department wishes to learn as soon as possible number of officers licensed for ocean steamers now out of employment and available for service to Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, and Australia. Wire not later than Saturday midnight your estimate for your district of such number under heading, masters, chief mates, second mates, third mates, chief engineers, first, second, third assistant engineers. Ask press to advise officers licensed for ocean service, especially with trans-Atlantic experience, to get in touch with you.

E. F. SWEET, Acting Secretary.

Following is a summary of the replies:

Ports.	Mas- ters.	Deck officers.			Engineers.			Total.
		First mates.	Sec- ond mates.	Third mates.	Chief.	First assist- ant.	Sec- ond assist- ant.	
ATLANTIC, NORTH.								
Baltimore, Md.....	5		1		6	4	3	14
Boston, Mass.....	36	10	10	1	20	7	13	107
Bridgeport, Conn.....	3	1	1	1	6	3		21
New York, N. Y.....	95	7	11	2	132	47	11	310
Norfolk, Va.....	7	2	2		33	12	6	78
Philadelphia, Pa.....	17	15	1		19	6		58
Portland, Me.....	20	21	31	40	33	28	40	253
Providence, R. I.....			1		1			2

Ports.	Mas- ters.	Deck officers.			Engineers.				Total.
		First mates.	Sec- ond mates.	Third mates.	Chief.	First assist- ant.	Sec- ond assist- ant.	Third assist- ant.	
ATLANTIC, SOUTH.									
Charleston, S. C.					7	5	6	12	30
Jacksonville, Fla.	10	2			12	1	4	5	34
Savannah, Ga.	1			1	2	1		1	6
Wilmington, N. C.	3	1				15			19
GULF.									
Galveston, Tex.	8	1	3		3	1	3	1	20
Mobile, Ala.	10	1			6	4	5	2	28
New Orleans, La.	17	1			20	9	12	7	66
Port Arthur, Tex.	2					1			3
PACIFIC.									
Los Angeles, Cal.	10				7	3	1		21
Portland, Ore.	1				3				4
San Francisco, Cal.	60	160	300	40	120	100	25	20	825
Seattle, Wash.	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	160
GREAT LAKES.									
Buffalo, N. Y.		1			18	1	1	1	22
Chicago, Ill.					7	2	2		11
Cleveland, Ohio.					1	1			2
Detroit, Mich.		1		1	5				7
Duluth, Minn.					1				1
Milwaukee, Wis.	10	10			10				30
Ogdensburg, N. Y.									
Toledo, Ohio.						1			1
Total.	335	254	381	106	492	272	153	145	2,133

<sup>1</sup> Fourteen of these not classified by the collector as to grade.

<sup>2</sup> Unclassified by the collector as to grade.

<sup>3</sup> See Shipowners' Association dispatch attached to that o. collectors.

2. List of vessels admitted to American registry under the emergency act, with statement as to when and where built, by whom owned, and what flag heretofore flying.

The number of American vessels documented at customhouses on June 30, 1914, was 26,943, of 7,928,688 gross tons. The number of these which were employed on the date of the Senate resolution it has not been found practicable to ascertain.

The number of outstanding licenses to officers on June 30, 1914, was as follows:

	Year of issue.					Total.
	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914	
Masters of steam vessels	1,806	1,698	4,550	4,497	2,407	14,958
Masters of steam yachts	1	2	1	1	2	7
Mates of ocean steamers	416	439	425	579	565	2,424
Mates of inland steamers	321	330	316	360	438	1,765
First-class pilots	703	804	1,169	1,256	838	4,770
Second-class pilots	711	592	924	1,110	588	3,925
Chief engineers	1,759	1,894	6,275	6,991	2,925	19,844
Assistant engineers	1,570	1,625	1,789	1,296	1,203	7,483
Special engineers	93	56	73	104	47	373
Joint pilots and engineers	159	32	31	27	15	264
Engineers, motor vessels	588	633	649	736	717	3,323
Operators of motor vessels	4,607	5,653	11,671	9,410	8,989	40,330
Masters, sail, over 700 gross tons	342	191	134	91	111	869
Mates, sail, over 700 gross tons	62	47	23	14	18	164
Masters, barges over 100 gross tons	18	10	6	10	8	52
Total	13,156	14,006	28,036	26,482	18,871	100,551

These figures do not cover the officers not required to be licensed on 11,452 sail vessels, barges, etc., who would amount to upward of 14,000. The number of officers actually employed at the date of the passage of the Senate resolution the department is unable to determine.

EXPLANATORY NOTE.—The number of outstanding licenses exceeds, of course, the number of men. Licenses are valid for five years, and the feasible way to approximate the number of licensed men (short of writing letters to all) is to take the total licenses issued during the past five years. Licenses may be renewed on written application at the end of each five years. Many men thus keep up their licenses as a matter of pride long after they have ceased going to sea (e. g., the list of available men in New York is headed by a master 73 years old). Some, of course, have died in five years and others become disabled, while still others have found more satisfactory employment ashore. The total contains duplicates in cases where in the earlier years named a man has been licensed for a lower grade and subsequently licensed for higher grades.

Respectfully,

E. F. SWEET,  
Acting Secretary.

The SECRETARY UNITED STATES SENATE,  
Washington, D. C.



Foreign-built vessels admitted to American registry under the act of Aug. 18, 1914.

Rig.	Name of vessel.	Gross tons.	When built.	Where built.	Name of owner.	Former nationality.
Steamship.	Oceana.	7,796	1891	Dumbarton, Scotland.	Morse Dry Dock & Repair Co.	British.
Do.	Moldegard.	2,852	1906	Bergen, Norway.	Ocean Freight Line (Inc.).	Do.
Bark.	Windrush.	1,531	1892	Sunderland, England.	Windrush Shipping Co. (Ltd.).	Do.
Steamship.	Yivives.	5,017	1911	Belfast, Ireland.	Yivives Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Trinidadian.	2,450	1892	Newcastle, England.	Gulf Refining Co.	Do.
Schooner.	Roseway.	291	1907	Shelburne, Nova Scotia.	Alfred L. Staples.	Do.
Steamship.	Santa Rosalia.	5,409	1911	Port Glasgow, Scotland.	United States Steel Products Co.	Do.
Do.	Kentra.	4,682	1906	do.	do.	Do.
Do.	Bantu.	4,188	1901	Wallsend on Tyne, England.	do.	Do.
Do.	Crofton Hall.	5,773	1913	Port Glasgow, Scotland.	do.	Do.
Bark.	Annie M. Reid.	2,165	1892	Glasgow, Scotland.	James Rolph, Jr.	Do.
Steamship.	San Francisco.	5,102	1914	Londonderry, Ireland.	United States Steel Products Co.	Do.
Do.	Buena Ventura.	4,881	1913	Newcastle, England.	do.	Do.
Do.	Charlton Hall.	4,740	1907	Port Glasgow, Scotland.	do.	Do.
Do.	Craster Hall.	4,319	1909	do.	do.	Do.
Do.	Howick Hall.	4,922	1910	do.	do.	Do.
Do.	Zacapa.	5,012	1909	Belfast, Ireland.	Zacapa Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Cartago.	4,937	1908	do.	Cartago Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Sixola.	5,017	1911	do.	Sixola Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Brabant.	2,773	1890	Newcastle on Tyne, England.	The Texas Co.	Belgian.
Do.	Foxton Hall.	4,246	1902	Sunderland, England.	United States Steel Products Co.	British.
Do.	Limon.	3,297	1904	Belfast, Ireland.	Limon Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Panuco.	2,556	1888	Walker on Tyne, England.	Freeport & Tampico Fuel Oil Transportation Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Pinar Del Rio.	2,504	1895	South Shields, England.	American & Cuban Steamship Line (Inc.).	Do.
Schooner.	C. W. Mills.	371	1904	Granville, Nova Scotia.	John George Murphy.	Do.
Steamship.	Suriname.	3,274	1908	Amsterdam, Holland.	Suriname Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Brindilla.	4,170	1894	Bredow, Germany.	Standard Oil Co.	German.
Do.	Turrialba.	4,952	1909	Belfast, Ireland.	Turrialba Steamship Corporation.	British.
Do.	Metapan.	5,011	1909	do.	Metapan Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Heredia.	4,943	1908	do.	Heredia Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Esparta.	3,297	1904	do.	Esparta Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Ship.	Avon.	1,572	1884	Glasgow, Scotland.	Avon Shipping Co. (Inc.).	Do.
Steamship.	Abangarez.	4,954	1909	Belfast, Ireland.	Abangarez Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Barkentine.	Everett G. Griggs.	2,577	1883	do.	Sterling Ship Co.	Do.
Steamship.	Coppename.	3,191	1908	do.	Coppename Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Bark.	Snowden.	1,111	1877	Port Glasgow, Scotland.	Snowden Shipping Co. (Inc.).	Do.
Steamship.	Platuria.	3,445	1892	Low Walker on Tyne, England.	Standard Oil Co.	German.
Do.	C. A. Canfield.	6,350	1913	Newcastle on Tyne, England.	Petroleum Transport Co.	British.
Do.	Parissima.	4,937	1908	Belfast, Ireland.	Parissima Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Almirante.	5,010	1909	do.	Almirante Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Atenas.	4,961	1909	do.	Atenas Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	San Jose.	3,296	1904	do.	San Jose Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Montano.	2,730	1890	Low Walker on Tyne, England.	Standard Oil Co.	German.
Do.	Caloria.	4,035	1906	Newcastle on Tyne, England.	do.	Do.
Schooner.	Louise M. Richard.	441	1906	Port Greville, Nova Scotia.	Ernest H. Richard.	British.
Steamship.	Marowijne.	3,191	1908	Belfast, Ireland.	Marowijne Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Saramacca.	3,283	1908	Amsterdam, Holland.	Saramacca Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Norman Bridge.	4,288	1913	Newcastle on Tyne, England.	Petroleum Transport Co.	Do.
Do.	Santa Marta.	5,013	1909	Belfast, Ireland.	Santa Marta Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Carrillo.	5,012	1911	do.	Carrillo Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Pastores.	7,781	1912	do.	Pastores Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Calamares.	7,782	1913	do.	Calamares Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Do.	Tenadores.	7,782	1913	do.	Tenadores Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Ship.	Brynildia.	1,502	1885	Glasgow, Scotland.	Brynildia Shipping Co. (Inc.).	Do.
Do.	Pass of Balmaha.	1,571	1888	do.	Pass of Balmaha Shipping Co. (Inc.).	Do.
Do.	Rhine.	1,690	1886	Greenock, Scotland.	Rhine Shipping Co. (Inc.).	Do.
Steamship.	Orleanian.	2,293	1880	Whitwich, Scotland.	Orleanian Steamship Corporation.	Do.
Barge.	Glenlul.	1,934	1884	Liverpool, England.	The Texas Co.	Belgian.
Do.	France Marie.	1,994	1900	Havre, France.	do.	Do.
Steamship.	Wico.	2,748	1888	Low Walker on Tyne, England.	Standard Oil Co.	German.
Do.	Dochra.	4,309	1906	Newcastle, England.	Barber & Co.	British.
Do.	Llama.	3,189	1890	Newcastle on Tyne, England.	Standard Oil Co.	German.
Do.	Edward L. Doheny.	6,170	1913	Walker on Tyne, England.	Petroleum Transport Co.	British.
Do.	Sacramento.	5,692	1900	Newcastle, England.	Northern & Southern Steamship Co.	German.
Barge.	Tuxpam.	869	1881	Port Glasgow, Scotland.	The Texas Co.	Belgian.
Do.	Panuco.	646	1868	Sunderland, England.	do.	Do.
Steamship.	Herbert G. Wylie.	4,292	1912	Newcastle, England.	Petroleum Transport Co.	British.
Barkentine.	Skoda.	744	1893	Kingsport, Nova Scotia.	Charles S. Bodden.	Do.
Bark.	Pilgrim.	1,629	1893	Port Glasgow, Scotland.	Pilgrim Shipping Co. (Inc.).	Do.
Ship.	Timandra.	1,579	1885	do.	Timandra Shipping Co. (Inc.).	Do.
Steamship.	Santa Clara.	2,584	1896	South Shields, England.	American & Cuban Steamship Line (Inc.).	Do.
Do.	Javary.	1,249	1907	Birkenhead, England.	L. C. Gillespie & Sons.	Do.
Do.	Charles E. Harwood.	3,178	1913	Walker on Tyne, England.	Petroleum Transport Co.	Do.
Bark.	Anna Maria d'Abundo.	954	1903	Castellammare, Italy.	McIntyre Lumber & Export Co.	Do.
Steamship.	Greenbrier.	3,331	1893	West Hartlepool, England.	Coast Steamship Co.	Do.
Schooner.	W. H. Baxter.	399	1893	Windsor, Nova Scotia.	J. C. Peterson.	Do.
Barkentine.	Stranger.	622	1893	Bridgewater, Nova Scotia.	Edward L. Whitney.	Do.
Steamship.	Robert Dollar.	5,353	1911	Port Glasgow, Scotland.	Dollar Steamship Line.	Do.
Do.	Streaus Romana.	5,275	1914	Einswarden, Germany.	Union Petroleum Steamship Co.	Roumania.
Barkentine.	St. Paul.	471	1890	Newport, Nova Scotia.	George J. Santa Cruz.	British.
Steamship.	Cushing.	6,894	1903	Jarrow, England.	Standard Oil Co.	German.
Do.	Cohusa.	5,732	1913	Port Glasgow.	W. R. Grace & Co.	British.
Do.	Oregon.	727	1890	Paisley, Scotland.	Andrew Olsen.	Norwegian.
Do.	Cacique.	6,202	1910	Sunderland, England.	W. R. Grace & Co.	British.
Ship.	Vincent.	1,904	1894	Dumbarton, Scotland.	New England Ship Co.	Do.
Steamship.	Mundale.	3,285	1906	Port Glasgow, Scotland.	Munson Steamship Line.	Do.
Ship.	Dunsyre.	2,149	1891	do.	Eschen & Miner.	Do.
Steamship.	Baton Rouge.	4,973	1913	Newcastle, England.	Standard Oil Co.	German.
Do.	Bayway.	5,084	1913	Kiel, Germany.	do.	Do.
Schooner.	Delta.	317	1892	Cheverie, Nova Scotia.	A. F. Dantzer.	British.
Steamship.	Petrolite.	3,710	1894	Stettin, Germany.	Standard Oil Co.	German.
Do.	Corning.	5,073	1913	Kiel, Germany.	do.	Do.
Ship.	Plottaloch.	2,254	1893	Belfast, Ireland.	Eschen & Miner.	British.
Do.	British Yeoman.	1,933	1880	Southampton, England.	do.	Do.
Steamship.	Gargyle.	4,433	1903	Greenock, Scotland.	Vacuum Oil Co.	German.
Bark.	Edna M. Smith.	816	1903	Harvey Bank, New Brunswick.	Alfred L. Staples.	British.
Steamship.	Princeton.	5,081	1912	Kiel, Germany.	Vacuum Oil Co.	German.
Do.	Somerset.	5,080	1913	do.	do.	Do.
Do.	Maracas.	2,925	1887	Wallsend on Tyne, England.	New York Transatlantic S. S. Co.	British.
Do.	Georgiana.	4,596	1909	West Hartlepool, England.	Union Sulphur Co.	Do.
Do.	Caddo.	6,330	1909	do.	Standard Oil Co.	Do.

<sup>1</sup> Burned at Watling Island, Bahamas, Sept. 22, 1914.<sup>2</sup> Schooner rigged.

To 'al December 12, 1914, 101 vessels, 361,078 gross tons.

The following telegram was sent to the collectors of customs at the following ports:

AUGUST 7, 1914.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS:

Notify press your district department wishes to learn as soon as possible number of officers licensed for ocean steamers now out of employment and available for service in Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, and Australia. Wire not later than Saturday midnight your estimate for your district of such number under heading, "Masters, chief mates, second mates, third mates, chief engineers, first, second, third assistant engineers." Ask press to advise officers licensed for ocean service, especially with trans-Atlantic experience, to get in touch with you.

E. F. SWEET, Acting Secretary.

Repeat to collectors of customs at: Portland, Me.; Boston, Mass.; Providence, R. I.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Ogdensburg, N. Y.; Buffalo, N. Y.; New York, N. Y.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Baltimore, Md.; Norfolk, Va.; Wilmington, N. C.; Charleston, S. C.; Savannah, Ga.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Mobile, Ala.; New Orleans, La.; Port Arthur, Tex.; Galveston, Tex.; Los Angeles, Cal.; San Francisco, Cal.; Portland, Oreg.; Seattle, Wash.; Duluth, Minn.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Detroit, Mich.; Chicago, Ill.; Cleveland, Ohio.

The following replies were received:

BALTIMORE, MD., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

Replying to your telegram 7th instant for number of licensed officers available this district, we have applications from three masters, one second mate, five chief engineers, and two first assistant engineers, all licensed for ocean service.

WM. F. STONE, Collector.

BALTIMORE, MD., August 10, 1914.

HONORABLE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

In addition to telegram Saturday night we now have application from two masters, one chief engineer, two first assistant engineers, three second assistant engineers.

WM. F. STONE, Collector.

BOSTON, MASS., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

Press notified throughout district about number licensed officers out of employment; every effort made to obtain desired information; can furnish now names and addresses chiefly trans-Atlantic experienced men, 22 masters, 5 chief mates, 8 second mates, 8 chief engineers, 5 first assistant engineers, 2 second assistant engineers. Accurate estimate impossible to state.

BILLINGS, Collector.

BOSTON, MASS., August 10, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

In addition to report of Saturday, licensed officers have registered to-day as follows: Fourteen masters, 5 first mates, 2 second mates, 1 third mate, 12 chief engineers, 2 first assistant engineers, 11 second assistants, 10 third assistants.

BILLINGS, Collector.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

One master, 1 chief mate, 1 chief engineer, 5 third assistant engineers licensed for ocean steamers to Europe, Asia, etc. Probably others will apply. Time since receipt of your telegram very short.

FRED ENOS, Collector.

BUFFALO, N. Y., August 8, 1914.

E. F. SWEET, Acting Secretary Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.:

Number of licensed officers available as far as known to local steamboat officers are 1 chief mate, 18 chief engineers, 1 first assistant engineer, 1 second assistant engineer, and 1 third assistant. Estimate about 8 engineers; 1 mate who would accept.

BRADISH, Special Deputy.

CHARLESTON, S. C., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

To best of my knowledge there are no masters, chief, second, or third mates with ocean licenses in this customs district. From best information obtainable it is estimated that there are 7 chief engineers, 5 first assistant, 6 second assistant, and 12 third assistant engineers with ocean-going licenses in district. Few, if any, of these have had trans-Atlantic experience.

PETERS, Collector.

CHICAGO, ILL., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

Only 2 chief engineers, both employed ashore, responded in answer to call contained in your telegram of 7th instant published in all Chicago papers. Twenty chief engineers, 5 assistant engineers, 20 masters licensed for ocean steamers by local inspectors steam vessels in this district during last five years. All supposed to be employed. Names and addresses will be furnished if desired.

MCNEILL, Collector.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

Can make no estimate of officers with ocean licenses here. One chief, one first assistant engineer reported to this office.

MASCHKE, Collector.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, August 8, 1914.

COMMISSIONER OF NAVIGATION, Washington, D. C.:

Following message received from Erie: "No American seamen having license for ocean service at Erie."

COLE, Collector in Charge.

DETROIT, MICH., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

Available for service to countries mentioned in your telegram: 5 chief engineers with ocean experience; 5 chief engineers with lake, bay, and sound license; 1 third mate; 1 first mate. No masters. Possibly a number of others holding chief engineer's license for lake, bay, and sound who would be eligible to receive salt-water license upon examination.

WHELAN, Collector.

DULUTH, MINN., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

One chief engineer for ocean steamers of 750 tons reported to this office out of employment. Possibly more names will be submitted later.

BURNETT, Collector.

ERIE, PA., August 8, 1914.

DEPARTMENT COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

No American citizens holding a license for service on ocean steamers at Erie.

T. H. COLE, Deputy Collector in Charge.

GALVESTON, TEX., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

Your telegram 7th. Add following names licensed officers: Nils Sjostrend, master, unlimited ocean vessels, 1522 Avenue G. Galveston; W. E. Towne, second assistant engineer, ocean vessels, 2621 Avenue P. Galveston; C. W. Solman, master, unlimited ocean, Texas City, Tex.; Gustavus Enell, master, unlimited ocean, care fire boat, Galveston.

PABST, Collector.

GALVESTON, TEX., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

Your telegram 7th instant. Following names and addresses: Guyon E. Barron, second mate, unlimited ocean-going license; address, 2005 Avenue N-and-half, Galveston. Louis Kleiper, third assistant engineer, ocean steamers, unlimited; address, care steamship *Denver*, Galveston. William Bierschenck, second mate, unlimited license; address, care Seamen's Bethel, Galveston. Alexander Williamson, first mate, unlimited license, ocean steamers; address, care steamship *City of Macon*, Galveston. I. M. Petersen, master, ocean going, unlimited, with American, British, and Norwegian license; address, 214 Thirteenth Street, Galveston. A. L. Davis, master, unlimited, ocean-going steamers; address, 101 Fourteenth Street, Galveston. Samuel M. Holt, master, ocean-going steamers, unlimited; address, till Tuesday next, Ocean Hotel, Galveston. T. J. Wilson, second assistant engineer, ocean steamers, unlimited; address 312 Tremont Street, Galveston. All the above open for employment for any service mentioned your telegram.

PABST, Collector.

GALVESTON, TEX., August 11, 1914.

SECRETARY COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

Your telegram 7th. Following additional names of licensed officers: James Bateman, chief engineer, ocean, unlimited, 3421 Avenue H, Galveston; J. H. Loomis, first assistant engineer, ocean, unlimited, U. S. transport *Sumner*, Galveston; L. Le Febvre, master, ocean, unlimited, care steamship *Saltilla*, Texas City, Tex.; Thomas H. Riley, second assistant engineer, ocean, unlimited, care Acme Hotel, Galveston; James P. Stevenson, late master U. S. transport *McClellan*, ocean, unlimited, with lot license, New York, Tampa, Key West, and Gulf coast, care Mr. Coleman, 1115 Twenty-second Street, Galveston, or care B. Schellenberger & Sons, 99 Myrtle Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.; A. J. Balter, second mate, unlimited, care transport *Kupatrick*, Galveston. Capt. Stevenson specially recommended; out of employment because *McClellan* used without master as refrigerating plant, Vera Cruz.

PABST, Collector.

GALVESTON, TEX., August 12, 1914.

SECRETARY COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

Your telegram 7th. Add following names: Ira Martin Benford, chief engineer, unlimited, ocean, address care steamship *Liberia*, Galveston, or 4615 Third Avenue, Brooklyn; Edo B. Eben, chief engineer, ocean, unlimited, care steamship *Denver*, Galveston.

PABST, Collector.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

Licensed officers reporting as available to this office as follows: Ten masters, 2 chief mates, 12 chief engineers, 1 first assistant, 4 second assistants, 5 third assistant engineers, of which most have had trans-Atlantic experience.

GRIGGS, Collector.

LOS ANGELES, CAL., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

Replying your telegram 7th instant, following licensed officers now available for service: Ten masters, 7 chief engineers, 3 first assistant engineers, 1 second assistant engineer.

ELLIOTT, Collector.



MILWAUKEE, WIS., August 8, 1914.

HONORABLE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Licensed officers ocean steamers available this district, estimated, best authority, 10 masters, 10 pilots, 10 chief engineers.

SCHULZ, Collector.

MOBILE, ALA., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, Washington, D. C.:

Officers available service ocean merchant vessels this district: Masters, 3; chief engineers, 2; first assistant engineers, 3; second assistant engineers, 5; third assistant engineers, 2; total, 15.

MAER, Collector.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

The following have registered this office as available for service on ocean steamers mentioned your telegram 7th instant: Masters, 4; chief engineers, 4; first assistant engineers, 2; second assistant engineers, 2; pursers, 2.

FOSTER, Collector.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., August 10, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

In addition to those reported in telegram 8th instant, the following have registered for service on ocean steamers: Eight masters, 8 chief engineers, 4 first assistant engineers, 7 second assistant engineers, 2 third assistant engineers, 1 first officer, 1 electrical engineer, 1 steward.

FOSTER, Collector.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., August 11, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

In addition to those reported previously, 2 masters, 3 assistant engineers, and 2 third engineers have registered here for service on ocean steamers.

FOSTER, Collector.

NEW YORK, N. Y., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

After fullest publicity in press and maritime associations, report the following officers licensed for ocean steamers now out of employment and available for service indicated: Sixty-five masters, 6 chief mates, 8 second mates, 2 third mates, 117 chief engineers, 45 first assistant engineers, 5 second assistant engineers, 4 third assistant engineers.

DUDLEY FIELD MALONE, Collector.

NEW YORK, N. Y., August 10, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Add following to list of officers furnished you Saturday: Masters, 30; chief mate, 1; second mates, 3; chief engineers, 15; first assistant engineers, 2; second assistant engineers, 6; third assistant engineer, 1.

DUDLEY FIELD MALONE, Collector.

NORFOLK, VA., August 8, 1914.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Replying to your telegram August 7 requesting number officers for ocean-going steamers now out of employment available for service to Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, and Australia. Press widely and promptly notified, and following have been listed upon application this district: Seven masters, 2 chief mates, 2 second mates, 33 chief engineers, 12 first assistant engineers, 6 second assistant engineers, 16 third assistant engineers; total, 78. Names and addresses available on file this office awaiting further instructions. Trans-Atlantic experience of available secured in all cases possible.

HAMILTON, Collector of Customs.

OGDENSBURG, N. Y., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Referring to your wire August 7 as to number of officers in this district licensed for ocean steamers now out of employment and available for service, I have complied with your request and have received no replies in response thereto.

DANIELS, Collector.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Have names of 11 masters, 14 mates, 15 chief engineers, and 6 first assistant engineers available, able for service on ocean steamers.

BERRY, Collector.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., August 10, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Bureau of Navigation, Washington, D. C.:

Six masters, 1 chief mate, 1 second mate, 4 chief engineers registered in addition to those reported on Saturday.

BERRY, Collector.

PORT ARTHUR, TEX., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Estimate licensed officers for ocean steamers available for service to Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, and Australia in the district of Sabine: Masters, 2; first assistant engineers, 3.

DUNN, Collector.

PORTLAND, ME., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Available in this district for ocean steamship force, 20 masters, 21 first mates, 31 second mates, 40 third mates, 33 chief engineers, 28 first assistant engineers, 40 second assistants, and 40 third assistants.

WILLIS T. EMMONS, Collector.

PORTLAND, OREG., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

As a result of the publication of your telegram following applications have been filed with this office: One master and three chief engineers, available for service to Europe, Africa, South America, or Australia. Owing to short time after publication, I am of opinion quite a number additional applications will be filed.

BURKE, Collector.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., August 6, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Press notified regarding licensed officers; wide newspaper publicity secured. Responses show one second mate and one chief engineer out of employment and available. Letter follows.

FITZSIMMONS, Collector.

SANDUSKY, OHIO, August 8, 1914.

COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS,  
Washington, D. C.:

No licensed officers available here for ocean service.

CALDWELL, Deputy.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Answering department telegram August 7, I estimate officers licensed for ocean steamers out of employment and available, based on report of Masters, Mates, and Pilots' Association and Marine Engineers' Association, is, masters, 60; chief mates, 160; second mates, 300; third mates, 40; chief engineers, 120; first assistants, 100; second assistants, 25; and third assistants, 20; total, 825. Shipowners' Association state they will show department by wire Monday above estimate greatly exaggerated.

J. O. DAVIS, Collector.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., August 11, 1914.

HON. WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,  
Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.:

Shipowners' Association of Pacific Coast, after such investigation and inquiry as time allowed, protest that number of masters unemployed having licenses for ocean-going steamers of 2,000 tons and upward is about 50; mates of all grades, about 250; engineers of all grades, about 200; some of mates have masters' licenses, but have never had commands. Some of masters, mates, and engineers are temporarily out of employment owing to coasting steamers being laid up during present business depression, but will soon be in former jobs as vessels resume coasting trade. Of these men holding licenses listed as unemployed some have voluntarily left the sea for shore occupations; others are unfit for sea duty by reason of age and other disabilities.

SHIPOWNERS' ASSOCIATION OF PACIFIC COAST,  
By W. F. SULLIVAN, Secretary.

SAVANNAH, GA., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

In compliance with your wire of 7th, report as follows: One master and probably one other, two chief engineers, one first assistant engineer, one third assistant engineer, one third mate.

DAVID C. BARROW, Jr., Collector.

SEATTLE, WASH., August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.:

Your telegram 7th. Approximately sufficient available masters, first, second, and third mates, chief engineers, first, second, and third engineers, with ocean certificates to man 20 vessels, good many of them with trans-Atlantic experience.

HARPER, Collector.

TOLEDO, OHIO (VIA CLEVELAND, OHIO), August 8, 1914.

COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS,  
Washington, D. C.:

Papers published substance your telegram of 7th. No returns. Has been suggested those available for service communicate direct with you since time limit is too brief for results here.

REED, Deputy Collector in Charge.

TOLEDO, OHIO, August 8, 1914.

SECRETARY TREASURY,  
Washington, D. C.:

In response to your telegram to collector at Cleveland relative to unemployed officers of vessels having had ocean service, one engineer has filed notice of desire to serve. Will mail particulars.

REED, Deputy Collector in Charge.

WILMINGTON, N. C., August 8, 1914.

HON. E. F. SWEET,  
Assistant Secretary, Washington, D. C.:

Replying your wire 7th. My estimate at this hour would be three masters, one chief mate, and five engineers.

WALKER TAYLOR, Collector.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,  
Duluth, Minn., August 8, 1914.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Complying with request in your telegram of August 7, 1914, concerning number of licensed officers for ocean steamers unemployed in this district, I have the honor to confirm telegram of even date as per copy inclosed.

I succeeded in getting this notice in the extra evening edition of the Duluth Evening Herald for August 7, and in the morning edition of the Duluth News-Tribune August 8, and in the Superior Telegram evening of August 8.

It is quite probable that additional names will be tendered from day to day, and if so, I will notify your department by letter or by telegram if you request it.

The one presenting himself at this office to-day is Henry S. Elliott, age 56, chief engineer for steamers of 750 tons. He has had 30 years of service as a sailor and is now out of employment and willing to accept a position on ocean steamers. His address is General Delivery, Duluth, Minn.

Services were also tendered by Stewart L. Woodford, of Lake City, Minn., who has recently been discharged from the Navy after four years of enlistment, holding the position of a noncommissioned officer with a good record. He is 22 years of age. During his four years of service he has been assigned to duty on the *Tennessee*, *Washington*, and *Arkansas*, and for some months engaged in the electrical department on the *Washington*, and was in the Paymaster's Department at the time of his discharge. He is consequently simply a common sailor.

Ben Alfthan, 512 West Superior Street, Duluth, Minn., a subject of Finland, with 10 years' experience as sailor on ocean vessels representing various nationalities and 5 years of service on American vessels. His position on American vessels has been that of a wheelman.

These are all the names that have been presented to date.

Respectfully,

HARRIS BENNETT,  
Collector of Customs.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,  
Duluth, Minn., August 10, 1914.

Honorable SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Referring further to the matter of securing names of unemployed licensed officers willing to serve in the ocean traffic, concerning which this office wrote you on the 8th instant, I have the honor to submit the name of William T. Comerford, 27 years old, chief engineer, licensed for steamers up to 150 tons on the ocean, and third assistant engineer for ocean steamers of unlimited tonnage. His address is B-7 St. Regis, Duluth, Minn. He states that he would not accept position unless tendered him by next Saturday and he would want to have his expenses paid to port of service.

Respectfully,

N. N. HENDERBERG,  
Special Deputy Collector.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,  
Port of Providence, R. I., August 8, 1914.

To the honorable the SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Supplementing telegram of even date, "Press notified regarding licensed officers. Wide newspaper publicity secured. Responses show one second mate and one chief engineer out of employment and available. Letter follows." I have to say that in the opinion of this office a considerable number of well-trained commanding and supervisory officers would be readily available if offers of employment of an attractive character were definitely made. The department will understand that in a small district, such as ours is, the number of men out of employment is never large unless the circumstances are exceptional. In ordinarily prosperous times licensed shipping officers are pretty certain to be busy either in their own line or in some other lucrative employment.

Awaiting the further instructions of the department, I am,

Respectfully,

FRANK E. FITZSIMMONS, Collector.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,  
Port of Toledo, Ohio, August 10, 1914.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Steamship officers available for ocean service.

Confirming my telegram to you of the 8th instant, in the matter above outlined, I transmit list obtained of the local steamboat inspectors of officers in this inspection district who are qualified for ocean service. Owing to time limit fixed by department for this reply I am unable to state who of those named are unemployed. All have kept their licenses renewed, and as far as the records show are fit for ocean service.

Respectfully,

CHAS. REED,  
Deputy Collector in Charge.

Chief engineers, ocean: Barnhart, Guy L., chief engineer, 2,000 gross tons, 520 Broad Street, Elyria, Ohio; Cunningham, John H., chief engineer, 4,000 gross tons, 316 Collingwood Place, Toledo, Ohio; Jones, William, chief engineer, 2,500 gross tons, Toledo, Ohio; Riebel, Clarence, chief engineer, 2,500 gross tons, Toledo, Ohio (general delivery); Saltonstall, George W., chief engineer, any tons, Flat D, the Highlands, Toledo, Ohio.

Third assistant engineer, ocean: Rake, Martin, third assistant engineer, ocean, 415 Platt Street, Toledo, Ohio.

WILMINGTON, N. C., August 10, 1914.

Hon. E. F. SWEET,

Acting Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Supplementing my wire of the 8th, I desire to revise my estimate as follows: Three masters, 1 chief mate, and 15 engineers.

Yours, respectfully,

WALTER TAYLOR, Collector.

WILMINGTON, N. C., August 7, 1914.

Hon. E. F. SWEET,  
Acting Secretary, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your telegram of even date relative to licensed officers for ocean steamers now out of employment, etc.

Have taken this up with the subports in my district, and also through the press of the prominent cities in my district, and will advise you later.

Respectfully,

WALKER TAYLOR, Collector.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., August 17, 1914.

Honorable SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Since my telegram of August 8, 1914, I have had applications from 2 masters, 1 second mate, 1 third mate, 5 chief engineers, 3 first assistant engineers, and 1 second assistant engineer holding ocean licenses; the majority of these have had trans-Atlantic experience.

Respectfully,

FRED EXOS, Collector.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., August 17, 1914.

The COMMISSIONER OF NAVIGATION,  
Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In addition to the number of persons who have registered in this office as available for service on ocean steamers, as reported by telegraph, the following have signified a desire to be considered in that connection: Chief engineer, 1; electrical engineer, 1.

Respectfully,

MURPHY J. FOSTER, Collector.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., August 18, 1914.

The COMMISSIONER OF NAVIGATION,  
Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In addition to the number of persons who have registered in this office as available for service on ocean steamers, as reported by telegraph, the following have signified a desire to be considered in that connection: Master, 1; chief engineers, 2.

Respectfully,

MURPHY J. FOSTER, Collector.

MOBILE, ALA., August 14, 1914.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: With further reference to department telegram of the 7th instant and reply of this office of the 8th instant, relative to officers available for service on merchant vessels, I have the honor to advise that there are available since the forwarding of this message 7 masters, 4 chief engineers, 1 first assistant engineer, and 1 mate.

By direction of the collector.

Respectfully,

H. S. SHAUGHNESSY,  
Special Deputy Collector.

CHICAGO, ILL., August 14, 1914.

The SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Since telegraphing you August 8 in answer to your telegram of August 7 relative to the number of officers licensed for ocean steamers and available for service to Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, and Australia, 1 master, 5 chief engineers, 2 first-class assistant engineers, and 2 second assistant engineers have made application to this office for positions on ocean steamers. Several others who are not citizens of the United States, who hold a license issued by a foreign Government, and several who are citizens of the United States and hold a license by a foreign Government for ocean steamers, have also made application. The names and addresses of the above can be furnished, if desired.

Respectfully,

RIVERS MCNEILL,  
Collector of Customs.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., August 15, 1914.

The COMMISSIONER OF NAVIGATION,  
Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In addition to the number of persons who have registered in this office as available for service on ocean steamers, as reported by telegraph, the following have signified a desire to be considered in that connection: Second assistant engineers, 2; purser, 1.

Respectfully,

CALHOUN FLUKER,  
Special Deputy Collector.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., August 14, 1914.

The COMMISSIONER OF NAVIGATION,  
Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In addition to the number of persons who have registered in this office as available for service on ocean steamers, as reported by telegraph, the following have signified a desire to be considered in that connection: Masters, 2; chief engineers, 5; second assistant engineer, 1; third assistant engineers, 3; steward, 1.

Respectfully,

MURPHY J. FOSTER, Collector.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., August 20, 1914.

The honorable SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Referring to department's telegram of the 7th instant, wherein this office is instructed to submit the lists of officers licensed for ocean steamers, and now out of employment, I have the honor to state that, in addition to those already submitted, 19 persons have registered, their classification being as follows: Eleven masters, 2 chief mates, 5 chief engineers, and 1 second assistant engineer.

Respectfully,

H. K. LATHY,  
Special Deputy Collector.



NEW ORLEANS, LA., August 19, 1914.

The COMMISSIONER OF NAVIGATION,  
Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In addition to the number of persons who have registered in this office as available for service on ocean steamers and whose names have been reported by telegraph and letter, the following have signified a desire to be considered in that connection: Masters, 2; second officer, 1; third assistant engineer, 1.

Respectfully,

MURPHY J. FOSTER, Collector.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., August 20, 1914.

The COMMISSIONER OF NAVIGATION,  
Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In addition to the number of persons who have registered in this office as available for service on ocean steamers and whose names have been reported by telegraph and letter, the following have signified a desire to be considered in that connection: Master, 1; chief engineer, 1; electrician, 1.

Respectfully,

MURPHY J. FOSTER, Collector.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,  
Galveston, Tex., August 31, 1914.Hon. EUGENE TYLER CHAMBERLAIN,  
Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The following navigating officers have called at this office and desire to make it known that they are ready for service on vessels of the United States:

G. Peterson, unlimited master's license, ocean-going vessels; pilot license for the Gulf of Mexico; address, 1114 Avenue B, Galveston.

Andrew Hanson, Norwegian license, first mate, unlimited; is citizen of the United States; address, care Gulf Fisheries Co., Galveston.

H. P. Hanson, master from Brazos Santiago to Miami, Fla., with pilot license in same waters; address, 1001 Market Street, Galveston.

P. A. Ostra holds unlimited chief mate license of the United States; address, 724 Broadway, Galveston.

Respectfully,

A. J. ROSENTHAL,  
Special Deputy Collector.

## FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS (H. DOC. NO. 1353).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to the order of the court, a list of cases filed under the French spoliation act of January 20, 1885, which cases were dismissed by the court for want of sufficient evidence, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

## CREDENTIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the certificate of the governor of South Dakota certifying that on the 3d day of November, 1914, Ed S. Johnson was chosen by the electors of the State of South Dakota a Senator from that State for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1915, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also laid before the Senate the certificate of the governor of Colorado certifying that on the 3d day of November, 1914, CHARLES S. THOMAS was chosen by the electors of the State of Colorado a Senator from that State for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1915, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BRISTOW presented the credentials of Charles Curtis, chosen by the electors of the State of Kansas a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1915, which were read and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. SHAFROTH presented the credentials of CHARLES S. THOMAS, chosen by the electors of the State of Colorado a Senator from that State for the term of six years beginning March 4, 1915, which were read and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a telegram in the nature of a petition from P. A. Pickett, of Leal, N. Dak., and a communication from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Towner, N. Dak., relative to the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors. The communications are short and I ask that they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petitions were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAL, N. DAK., December 12, 1914.

Senator A. J. GRONNA,  
Washington, D. C.:

Undersigned petition Congress to submit amendment prohibiting importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors. J. W. Widdfield, P. A. Pickett, J. O. Jensen, R. H. Arthur, C. S. Treaster, H. C. Smith, E. B. Willson, L. Johnston, A. L. Willson, J. C. Hilborn, H. M. Pickett, Howard Willson, and T. W. Twisleton.

P. A. PICKETT.

TOWNER, N. DAK., December 9, 1914.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the regular meeting of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, held the 8th of December, with some 20 members present,

it was unanimously voted to send letters to our Representatives at Washington to ask them to vote for constitutional prohibition. We have been proud of the stand taken by our North Dakota Representatives, and we feel confident they will stand by the principles of our State, both in the House and Senate.

Sincerely, yours,

LOTTIE ROSENCRANS, President.  
MARY BROOKS, Vice President.  
CLARA McDONALD, Secretary.  
VIOLO FOUTS, Treasurer.

Per MRS. VIOLA FOUTS.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of the Industrial Association of Fort Scott, Kans., praying for the reduction of the present rate on first-class mail matter from 2 to 1 cent per ounce, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of St. Francis and Bison, in the State of Kansas, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRISTOW presented memorials of sundry citizens of Wichita, Thayer, Emporia, Hutchinson, Wellington, Udall, Chanute, Florence, and Galena, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to exclude anti-Catholic publications from the mails, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Udall, Kans., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lubec, Me., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have a communication in the nature of a memorial from the Western Association of Short Line Railroads, remonstrating against the passage of certain bills affecting mail transportation. I ask that the communication may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SHORT LINE RAILROADS,  
San Francisco, December 3, 1914.Hon. MARCUS A. SMITH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the short-line railroads of the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, held in San Francisco on November 16 last, for the purpose of securing more equitable compensation for the handling of railway mail, and which resulted in the formation of a permanent organization known as the Western Association of Short Line Railroads, the following resolutions were adopted:

"Whereas there are two bills—H. R. 17042, known as the Moon bill, and S. 6405, known as the Bourne bill—now under consideration in the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the United States Senate, the former already having passed the House; and

"Whereas House bill 17042 changes the basis of mail transportation rates from a weight to practically a space basis and invests the Postmaster General with autocratic power in regulating the compensation, character of service, form of equipment, even to compelling the use of steel cars for mail carrying, and gives him the power to impose a fine of \$5,000 per day for refusal of a railroad to carry the mail at the rates of compensation and in the manner specified by him; and

"Whereas Senate bill 6405 provides exclusively a space basis to determine the rate of payment for carrying the mail and leaves the designation of the limit of space and the character of equipment wholly to the Postmaster General to determine and gives him the power to impose a fine of \$5,000 per day in the same manner and for the same reasons as in H. R. 17042: Now therefore be it

"Resolved, That the short-line railroads operating in the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming most earnestly protest against the enactment of either H. R. 17042 or S. 6405 as being grossly unfair to such railroads, in that their mail revenue, which at present is entirely inadequate for the service rendered, will be arbitrarily reduced thereby in the face of an ever-increasing weight of postal matter.

"The rates of compensation provided for in these bills were based on data gathered all over the length and breadth of the United States and their rates fixed, according to their proponents, upon the averages so obtained.

"The short-line railroads of the States west of the Rocky Mountains, due to the sparsely settled condition of the country, the heavy mountain grades, and long hauls between stations, are operating under conditions far more expensive than those existing in other parts of the United States, and the majority of these railroads operate but one mixed train per day each way, so that it should be apparent that no such average can be fairly applied to the western roads, where all operating costs are excessive, as compared with those in the densely populated East.

"An exclusive 'space' or an exclusive 'weight' basis is unadapted to service which requires weight for the transportation of the mail itself and space for the distributing post-office service in cars as an incidental factor. The weight determines the actual mail carried; also determines what transportation service is rendered the Government. It is the very basis upon which the Government accepts mail from the public for transportation, even to a single letter; also that an exclusive space basis would give the employees of the Post Office Department absolute control over the amount of compensation to be paid railroads according to their opinions or inclinations, and might be used for personal advantage or political gain.

"The Bourne bill further provides that the Postmaster General shall not have authority to authorize the payment for more than 7 lineal feet of space for closed-pouch service in any one train. It is immaterial how much space the postal matter delivered to the railroad for transportation will occupy, be it 10, 15, or 20 feet. Only 7 feet will be paid for, and when such railroad operates but one train per day it has no opportunity to equalize this burden.

"Radiating from the terminal and from points on the line of most of the short-line railroads of the States mentioned, numerous star routes carry the mail by wagon or motor to the small towns and ranches not reached by the railroad. These star routes are a continuation of the railroads in so far as the mail is concerned, and the retail merchants of the communities off the railroad are profiting by this fact, because the parcel-post rates, including wagon haul, are less in many instances even than the freight rates on the railroads; consequently the wagon haul from the railroad to destination is accomplished at no cost to the shipper. In this manner immense shipments of foodstuffs and other matter, in the aggregate running into tons and carloads in each consignment, and consisting of flour, bran, canned goods, cement, coal, pressed brick, etc., are sent by parcel post, the Government paying out for the team haul alone in many instances more than the total sum received by it for the entire haul by rail and team, and the railroad receives little or nothing for a tonnage that legitimately belongs to it and for the transportation of which it was formerly paid for as freight or express.

"Since the last quadrennial weighing of the mail in the West the packers have reduced the standard weight of merchandise packages to about 48 pounds. Mail contractors, builders, and merchants have been quick to take advantage of this, which has not benefited the consumer, and as a consequence the railroads are hauling a tonnage of postal matter for which they receive no pay whatever.

"It is a matter of common knowledge that most of the short-line railroads in the Western States are struggling for a mere existence, and if the carrying of the United States mail is to become a heavy burden it will mean that freight and passenger rates will have to be advanced, to the detriment of the public in the communities served, in order to make up the loss caused by the transportation of the mail for which the Government will not pay a just compensation.

"We are not condemning the parcel-post act in principle, but we object to a condition which permits these freak and unintended shipments as outlined, and if the same are permitted to continue we ask for a fair compensation for carrying them: Now, therefore, be it further

*Resolved*, That the short-line railroads in the States mentioned urge as a solution to the mail-pay question, fair to both the Government and the railroads alike, that the present law regulating railroad mail pay be amended so as to provide for annual instead of quadrennial mail weight pay for apartments in cars used as traveling post offices, and relief from carrying the mail between railroad stations and post offices.

"In the event that Congress shall not deem it advisable to amend the present law as suggested, we then urge most strongly against the passage of either Senate bill No. 6405 or House bill 17042 for the reasons stated and because they will make a serious situation still worse, and that the entire matter of fixing rates of compensation for the railroads for carrying United States mail be placed in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission with full power to act."

We respectfully request your careful consideration of the foregoing necessarily lengthy resolutions, and we will greatly appreciate an expression of your opinion in reference to the same.

Very truly, yours,

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SHORT LINE RAILROADS,  
By D. M. SWORE, President,  
By CLARENCE M. ODDIE, Secretary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 6780) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer a portion of the lighthouse reservation, Tawas, Mich., to the Secretary of the Treasury (Rept. No. 836);

A bill (S. 6781) to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10 (Rept. No. 837); and

A bill (S. 6782) to provide for the appointment of certain assistant inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, at ports where they are actually performing duty but to which they are at present detailed (Rept. No. 833).

#### INTERNAL-REVENUE COLLECTIONS.

Mr. SIMMONS. From the Committee on Finance I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 6686) to supplement an act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," approved October 22, 1914, and I submit a report (No. 839) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask the Senator from North Carolina to explain briefly what is the proposed amendment of the act?

Mr. SIMMONS. It is the bill introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] a few days ago, and it provides that if the returns are made on the taxes paid on or before the 1st day of January instead of on or before the 1st day of December, as required in the act, the penalty shall not be imposed.

Mr. SMOOT. From the reading of the title of the bill I did not understand what the bill proposes, but with that explanation I have no objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was, beginning on page 1, line 6, after the words "so as to provide as follows," to strike out the remainder of the bill and insert:

That no penalty or additional tax shall be collected on account of the failure of any person, firm, or company to make return or to pay any tax imposed by said act on or before the 1st day of December, 1914, provided such return and payment shall be made on or before the 1st day of January, 1915; and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall, upon the filing of such return and upon the payment of such tax on or before the said 1st day of January, 1915, abate or refund any penalty or additional tax assessed or collected on account of failure to file such return or to pay such tax prior to the said 1st day of December, 1914.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### TREATMENT OF TUBERCULOSIS (S. DOC. NO. 641).

Mr. RANDELL. On the 10th instant there was received a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, in response to a resolution of May 26, 1913, a report by the United States Public Health Service of its investigation of the methods and practices employed by Drs. Karl and Silvio von Ruck in treating tuberculosis and rendering persons immune from tuberculosis, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine. On behalf of that committee I report the following order and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The order was read and agreed to, as follows:

*Ordered*, That the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, in response to a Senate resolution of May 26, 1913, a report by the United States Public Health Service relative to the methods and practices employed by Drs. Karl and Silvio von Ruck in treating tuberculosis and rendering persons immune from tuberculosis be printed as a document.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 6916) to amend section 857 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 6917) granting a pension to David Roach; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 6918) to increase the limit of cost of the Federal building authorized at Wilson, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 6919) to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 6920) granting a pension to George L. Hollis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 6921) granting an increase of pension to Amos Poe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 212) for a commemoration of the second inaugural of Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on Rules.

#### COPIES OF PATENTS.

Mr. BRISTOW submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 502), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the Commissioner of Patents be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to furnish the Committee on Cuban Relations of the Senate of the United States copies of the following patents, issued to Daniel B. Luten from the year 1900 to the present time:

No. 649643, dated May 15, 1900. Arch bridge.  
No. 785076, dated March 21, 1905. Arch.  
No. 802004, dated October 17, 1905. Centering for and method of constructing arches.  
No. 818386, dated April 17, 1906. Arch structures.  
No. 830483, dated September 4, 1906. System of reinforcement.  
No. 804224, dated January 1, 1907. Arch and analogous structure.  
No. 852970, dated May 7, 1907. Bridge of concrete or other analogous material.  
No. 852971, dated May 7, 1907. Masonry and concrete structure.  
No. 853183, dated May 7, 1907. Concrete or similar arch.  
No. 853202, dated May 7, 1907. Arch structure.  
No. 853203, dated May 7, 1907. Arch.  
No. 853204, dated May 7, 1907. Arch structure.  
No. 923058, dated May 25, 1909. Bridge or arch of concrete or other analogous material.  
No. 933771, dated September 14, 1909. Concrete bridge.  
No. 934411, dated September 14, 1909. Wall.  
No. 979776, dated December 27, 1910. Reinforced structure.  
No. 989272, dated April 11, 1911. Reinforced structure.



No. 998704, dated July 25, 1911. Surface drain.  
 No. 999063, dated August 1, 1911. Reinforced concrete construction.  
 No. 1004051, dated September 26, 1911. Skew arch.  
 No. 1005051, dated October 3, 1911. Arch center.  
 No. 1009676, dated November 21, 1911. Arch vault and conduit, etc.  
 No. 1027742, dated May 28, 1912. Arch viaduct.  
 No. 1048843, dated December 31, 1912. Masonry and reinforced concrete structure.  
 No. 1060917, dated May 6, 1913. Arch.  
 No. 1060918, dated May 6, 1913. Arch.  
 No. 1060919, dated May 6, 1913. Clamp for concrete reinforcing members.  
 No. 1060920, dated May 6, 1913. Concrete bridge.  
 No. 1060921, dated May 6, 1913. Concrete bridge.  
 No. 1060922, dated May 6, 1913. Arch.  
 No. 1070707, dated August 19, 1913. Reinforced structure.  
 No. 1070903, dated August 19, 1913. Reinforced bar.  
 No. 1078365, dated November 11, 1913. Beam.  
 No. 1078510, dated November 11, 1913. Concrete reinforce.  
 No. 1108880, dated August 11, 1914. False work.  
 No. 1089487, dated March 10, 1914. Beams.  
 No. 1089488, dated March 10, 1914. Building reinforced concrete arches.  
 No. 1090081, dated March 10, 1914. Bridge construction.  
 No. 13833, dated November 24, 1914. Concrete bridges.  
 No. 885386, dated April 21, 1898. Bridge construction, W. Sharp.

#### REPORT OF ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers and illustrations, referred to the Committee on Printing:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Isthmian Canal Commission and the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 14, 1914.

#### FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 6689) making appropriation for the arrest and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease, and for other purposes.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will not attempt to have that done at this time. It is very important that we should proceed with the consideration of the safety-at-sea convention, and I feel constrained to make a motion to go into executive session.

Mr. GORE. I should like to say to the Senator from Missouri that if the consideration of the bill leads to any extended debate I shall consent that it be laid aside. It is a bill to make an appropriation for the suppression of the foot-and-mouth disease. The Agricultural Department will have exhausted within this week all the money available for the use of the Bureau of Animal Industry. It is a matter of the highest urgency that this appropriation shall be made at once. I repeat, if the bill occasions any extended debate, I shall not insist upon its consideration.

Mr. STONE. Very well, Mr. President. On the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma that if the bill leads to debate he will not press it I shall not object; but I wish to say in yielding for the consideration of this one bill that it shall not be taken as a precedent for the consideration of other measures, and I desire to give notice that I intend, after this bill is disposed of, to press the motion for an executive session.

Mr. GORE. I sympathize with the purpose and plan of the Senator from Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the sum of \$2,500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and it is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture in the arrest and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease, and to supply a deficiency in the appropriation "General expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry," of \$1,597,996 in the "Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915," approved June 30, 1914.

Mr. STONE. I desire to ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether such an appropriation bill as this seems to be can properly originate in the Senate?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I would not undertake to give a definite answer to that question. Within the last few days I have read the Senate document printed at the request of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], which reviews this subject generally. The weight of opinion evidently is that general supply bills can not originate in the Senate, while other appropriation bills can. This is to meet a deficiency, and I confess I can not answer the Senator's query; it is a mooted question.

Mr. STONE. I make no point against the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me this is rather a strange way to pass a deficiency appropriation bill. The bill has never been referred to the Appropriations Committee; it was introduced in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This is the first time in my experience that I have ever seen a deficiency of a million and a half dollars appropriated for by the action of the Senate without the bill having been referred to the Appropriations Committee.

I will also say to the Senator from Oklahoma that such bills have always first passed the House of Representatives, have come to the Senate, been referred to the Committee on Appropriations, reported, and then acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, there is no doubt that general deficiency bills and urgent deficiency bills, considered as supply measures, originate in the other House; that is the uniform procedure. This bill is in part a deficiency bill and in part it is not so. In part it anticipates future expenses, and as the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is the committee to consider appropriations for the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture, I assume that there is no impropriety in the bill having been referred to that committee, since it applies to anticipated expenses.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the amount of appropriation provided in the bill other than the deficiency is only about a million dollars.

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. I think, if we are going to pass this bill at all, we ought to make it apply to the foot-and-mouth disease and not include a deficiency appropriation. We should let the House deal with that subject and then pass the appropriation in its regular order in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it is the extreme urgency and need of this appropriation that constitutes my reason and my excuse for pressing the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that if he will amend the bill so that it will provide for the appropriation of a million dollars, and have it so framed that the sum will be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture in the arrest and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease, and stop there, I shall have no objection at all to the passage of the bill; but I certainly do object to passing a bill here to take care of a deficiency.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Utah will not object to the passage of this bill. It is intended to meet an extreme urgency. It is a bill for the passage of which people have been sending telegrams here in large numbers. The necessity for the passage of the bill is extremely urgent, and it ought to be promptly passed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado need not tell me that; I know it; but I say that the \$1,597,996 proposed to be appropriated in the bill has already been expended; there is no particular hurry in having a bill passed to cover that deficiency; but there is an urgency in appropriating a million dollars now to continue this work. To that I have no objection. I will agree that the bill shall now be passed with an amendment providing for the appropriation of a million dollars.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The sum which has been expended in excess of the appropriation has been spent at the urgent solicitation of the agricultural departments of the various States which have been affected by the foot-and-mouth disease. This is unquestionably a good measure in the sense of the expenditure having been proper and necessary, and it seems to me, and so the committee thought, that one bill ought to cover the entire matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that may be the opinion of the Senator from Colorado, but it is not my opinion. I am perfectly willing, as I have said, that the bill shall be amended carrying the sum of a million dollars to be expended for this purpose, and stop there; but I do not believe that there ought to be added to the bill a deficiency appropriation, because that is not the way such deficiencies are provided for.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. GORE. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to supplement what the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] has just said by this, that it has not only been the uniform practice of the Government for the other House to originate all general supply bills, but it is unconstitutional for the Senate to originate one. All deficiency bills are general supply bills, and, in so far as this is a deficiency bill, it falls within that rule; in so far as it is a specific appropriation for a specific purpose it does not, and I express the hope

that the Senator from Oklahoma will accept the suggestion made by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, under the circumstances I wish to add my request to that of the Senator from Utah, that for the present the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry accept the proposition which has been made. I feel sure that the deficiency which has already been incurred will be provided for—and it ought to be provided for—by the Committee on Appropriations; but it is true that the Committee on Agriculture in the main always controls its own appropriations; and there is no question that it ought to control the amount proposed to be appropriated for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease. Of course, there is some question as to whether this measure should originate in the House, but I feel sure that that will be overlooked. I hope the Senator will accept this proposition, and we will take care of the deficiency very soon.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the suggestion I make to the Senator is this: Strike out "\$2,500,000," in line 3, and insert "\$1,000,000"; and strike out all after the word "disease," in line 7, so that the bill will simply provide \$1,000,000 for the arrest and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator know whether the deficiency that is mentioned was caused in large part by the expenditure of money for the emergency that had to be met by the breaking out of this disease?

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt, Mr. President, that the money was expended for that very purpose; but it is a deficiency, and the Constitution of the United States plainly provides how such deficiencies shall be provided for. There is not any doubt, I will say to the Senator, that the deficiency will be provided for, but it should be provided for in the proper way.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to inquire, further, if there would be any objection to increasing the amount of the appropriation so as to make it two and a half million dollars instead of a million dollars, and make no reference whatever to the deficiency?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the department say a million dollars is all they want. There would be objection to having the appropriation increased to \$2,000,000 with the idea that a part of that appropriation should be applied to pay the deficiency, because the Secretary of Agriculture would not have any authority to do that.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to state, with the consent of the Senator from Oklahoma—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor. There are several Senators on the floor, and the Chair does not know to whom the Senator from Oklahoma yields.

Mr. GORE. I will yield for a moment to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, in view of the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from Utah, I desire to make a suggestion. As I recall, the Agricultural appropriation bill of a year ago authorized the department to direct the killing of animals which might have been exposed to the disease and to reimburse the owners to a certain amount. Now, it would seem that, as the Senator has sought to limit the appropriation to \$1,000,000 and to strike out the latter part of the pending bill referring to the deficiency in the appropriation for "General expenses" under the act of 1915, approved June 30, 1914, the authority conferred by the bill as it is proposed to amend it would not be broad enough; in other words, I believe the bill, if it is to be amended, should further be changed so as to authorize the payment of a part of this money to the owners of animals which the Bureau of Animal Industry may order killed.

Mr. GORE. I have an amendment which I think will meet that suggestion.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that that is part of the law now, and so it would not be necessary.

Mr. POMERENE. Well, Mr. President, I understand that to be the law now, but, under the phraseology which the Senator from Utah has suggested, the expenditure of this \$1,000,000 would be limited simply to the arrest and eradication of the disease. I doubt whether the language would be broad enough to authorize payments from this particular appropriation for animals killed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that that is exactly what the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for. He wants a million dollars, to be expended hereafter, for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease. The bill, if amended as I have suggested, will appropriate a million dollars for that purpose.

Mr. POMERENE. But the Senator does not provide that it shall be expended under the existing law; he simply provides that it shall be expended in the arrest and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease. There should be some reference to the existing law, so as to permit of the payment of any portion of this sum which the department might find necessary to the owners of cattle which may be killed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not going to object to having the bill read "under the act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, approved June 30, 1914."

Mr. POMERENE. That would avoid any question.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing that those words should remain in the bill, though I do not believe they are necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 3, after the words "sum of," it is proposed to strike out "\$2,500,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "\$1,000,000," and in line 7, after the word "disease," to strike out the comma and the words "and to supply a deficiency in the appropriation 'General expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry,' of \$1,597,996 in," and insert the word "under," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the sum of \$1,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and it is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture in the arrest and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease, under the "Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915," approved June 30, 1914.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. I send to the desk an amendment which I desire to offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "disease," in line 7, it is proposed to insert "and in the payment of claims arising out of past and future purchases and destruction of animals affected by or exposed to the foot-and-mouth disease."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. GORE. That may require an amendment, in view of the amendment adopted at the suggestion of the Senator from Utah. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if that conforms to his amendment, or does it require a change?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think the amendment of the Senator as just offered is necessary, since we have retained the language in the latter part of the bill.

Mr. GORE. This amendment was suggested by the department, but I rather think it is unnecessary in view of the change made in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I included in the amendment offered by myself the words "under the act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, approved June 30, 1914," which cover virtually the same matter that the Senator proposes to cover by his amendment.

Mr. GORE. Very well. Then I withdraw the amendment.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill making appropriation for the arrest and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease."

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 4 hours and 40 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

#### REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6060, the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITE in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6060. The question is on agreeing to the motion.



The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask that the bill be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be laid aside temporarily.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 15, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate December 14, 1914.*

##### CONSULS.

Thomas D. Bowman, of Missouri, now vice and deputy consul at Nogales, to be consul of the United States of America at Fernie, British Columbia, Canada, vice Frank C. Denison, nominated to be consul at Prescott.

José de Olivares, of Missouri, now consul at Madras, to be consul of the United States of America at Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, vice James M. Shepard, resigned.

James H. Goodier, of New York, now consul at Tahiti, to be consul of the United States of America at Niagara Falls, Ontario, Canada, vice Edwin W. Trimmer, resigned.

Milton B. Kirk, of Illinois, now consul at St. Johns, Quebec, to be consul of the United States of America at Orillia, Ontario, Canada, vice Harry P. Dill, resigned.

Frank C. Denison, of Vermont, now consul at Fernie, to be consul of the United States of America at Prescott, Ontario, Canada, vice Martin R. Sackett, resigned.

John Fowler, of Massachusetts, now consul at Foochow, to be consul of the United States of America at Rimouski, Quebec, Canada, vice Frederick M. Ryder, nominated to be consul general at Singapore.

Nelson T. Johnson, of Oklahoma, now vice and deputy consul general and interpreter at Shanghai, to be consul of the United States of America at Chungking, China, vice E. Carleton Baker, nominated to be consul at Nagasaki.

Albert W. Pontius, of Minnesota, now consul at Newchwang, to be consul of the United States of America at Foochow, China, vice John Fowler, nominated to be consul at Rimouski.

Albro L. Burnell, of Maine, now vice and deputy consul general at Rio de Janeiro, to be consul of the United States of America at Rouen, France, vice Lucien Memminger, nominated to be consul at Madras.

Thomas B. L. Layton, of Louisiana, to be consul of the United States of America at Tahiti, Society Islands, vice James H. Goodier, nominated to be consul at Niagara Falls.

John Q. Wood, of Hawaii, now consul general at Adis Ababa, to be consul of the United States of America at Chemnitz, Germany, vice Frank Deedmeyer, resigned.

Carl F. Deichman, of Missouri, now consul at Nagasaki, to be consul of the United States of America at Bombay, India, vice Henry D. Baker, resigned.

Lucien Memminger, of South Carolina, now consul at Rouen, to be consul of the United States of America at Madras, India, vice José de Olivares, nominated to be consul at Hamilton, Ontario.

Lucien N. Sullivan, of Pennsylvania, now consul at La Paz, to be consul of the United States of America at Newcastle, New South Wales, Australia, vice George B. Killmaster, resigned.

E. Carleton Baker, of California, now consul at Chungking, to be consul of the United States of America at Nagasaki, Japan, vice Carl F. Deichman, nominated to be consul at Bombay.

##### CONSULS GENERAL.

Edwin S. Cunningham, of Tennessee, now consul general at Singapore, to be consul general of the United States of America at Hankow, China, vice Julian H. Arnold, resigned.

Frederick M. Ryder, of Connecticut, now consul at Rimouski, to be consul general of the United States of America at Singapore, Straits Settlements, vice Edwin S. Cunningham, nominated to be consul general at Hankow.

##### REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Henry A. Meier, of Lincoln, Nebr., to be register of the land office at Lincoln, Nebr., vice Charles F. Shedd, deceased.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

###### CAVALRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. George H. Sands, Seventh Cavalry, to be colonel from December 10, 1914, vice Col. Charles A. P. Hatfield, unassigned, retired from active service December 9, 1914.

Maj. Lewis M. Koehler, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from December 10, 1914, vice Lieut. Col. George H. Sands, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Frank S. Armstrong, Cavalry, unassigned, to be major from December 8, 1914, vice Maj. Arthur Thayer, Seventh Cavalry, detailed in the Quartermaster Corps.

Capt. James G. Harbord, First Cavalry, to be major from December 10, 1914, vice Maj. Lewis M. Koehler, Fifteenth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Grice P. Disque, Third Cavalry, to be captain from December 8, 1914, vice Capt. Walter M. Whitman, Eighth Cavalry, detailed in the Quartermaster Corps.

First Lieut. Alvin S. Perkins, Cavalry, unassigned, to be captain from December 8, 1914, vice Capt. Edward A. Sturges, Fifth Cavalry, detailed in the Quartermaster Corps.

First Lieut. Robert M. Barton, Fifth Cavalry, to be captain from December 10, 1914, vice Capt. James G. Harbord, First Cavalry, promoted.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Daniel W. Wurtzbaugh, an additional number in grade, to be a commander in the Navy from the 10th day of July, 1914.

Lieut. Commander Ralph Earle to be a commander in the Navy from the 10th day of July, 1914.

Ensign Ralph E. Sampson to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1914.

Machinist Axel V. Kettels to be a chief machinist in the Navy from the 23d day of December, 1913.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Robert T. S. Lowell to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1914.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Clyde R. Robinson to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1914.

##### REJECTION.

*Executive nomination rejected by the Senate December 14, 1914.*

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

John D. Lynn to be United States attorney for the western district of New York.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

*Monday, December 14, 1914.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal One, by whom and through whom are all things, we thank Thee for life and its attendant blessings. "As the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater," so let Thy spirit descend in full measure upon us, that the sunshine of Thy love may fill our hearts and quicken our lives, that they may bring forth abundantly of rich fruits, that the world may be a little better that we have lived and wrought, and Thine be the praise through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

##### THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS (H. DOC. NO. 1350).

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting an official copy of a resolution of both houses of the Philippine Legislature, received in the last mail from Manila, expressing appreciation and satisfaction to the House of Representatives for the passage of the Jones bill, and requesting approval thereof by the President and Senate, which was ordered to be filed and printed. The resolution was read, as follows:

[Third Philippine Legislature, third session.]

Resolution of both houses of the legislature in joint session assembled expressing their high appreciation to the House of Representatives of the United States for the passage of the Jones bill, and requesting the same approval thereof by the President and Senate.

The Philippine Commission and Philippine Assembly, in joint session assembled in the marble hall of the Ayuntamiento, have—  
*Resolved*, That they express their highest appreciation and satisfaction to the House of Representatives of the United States for the favorable action taken in the matter of the Jones bill, notwithstanding the difficulties encountered, and that they earnestly request the President and Senate of said Nation to likewise approve said bill, so that, in extending the powers of government conferred to the Filipinos and in opening up new paths to their national liberty, the Filipino people may be in condition to work out their own welfare and prosperity and may in every other respect be responsible for their own destinies.

And resolved further, That the honorable the Governor General be, and he hereby is, requested to transmit this message by cable to the United States.

Adopted October 16, 1914.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted by both houses of the legislature sitting in joint session on October 16, 1914.

GEORGE L. LOGAN,  
Secretary Philippine Commission.  
THEODORE M. KALAW,  
Secretary Philippine Assembly.

#### POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOON, chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, by direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 19906) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 1219), which was read a first and second time, and, with accompanying papers, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STAFFORD reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority members of the committee who desire to file views in opposition to those of the majority may have two days in which to do so.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield for a moment?

Mr. MOON. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not catch the number of days that the members of the minority were to have to file their views.

Mr. MOON. I ask unanimous consent that they have two days in which to do so.

Mr. STAFFORD. Could not the gentleman make it three days?

Mr. MOON. Well, this is a pretty big report, and the chairman of the committee had 18 hours in which to make it.

Mr. STAFFORD. When does the gentleman intend to take the bill up?

Mr. MOON. At the first opportunity that I can call it up.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the minority may have two days in which to file its views. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. WILSON of Florida, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6687. An act to authorize the Chesapeake & Ohio Northern Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River a short distance above the mouth of the Little Scioto River between Scioto County, Ohio, and Greenup County, Ky., at or near Sciotoville, Ohio.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the business of the Senate be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tribute to the memory of Hon. IRVIN S. PEPPER, late a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Iowa.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That the Secretary send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 1373. An act for the relief of the estate of John Stewart, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6687. An act to authorize the Chesapeake & Ohio Northern Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River a short distance above the mouth of the Little Scioto River between Scioto County, Ohio, and Greenup County, Ky., at or near Sciotoville, Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Sundry messages, in writing, from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the

state of the Union for the purpose of further considering the bill H. R. 19422, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. GARNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19422) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For the condemnation of small park areas at the intersection of streets outside of the limits of the original city of Washington, from such areas shown on the map on file in the office of the engineer commissioner, in the discretion of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to be acquired in accordance with the provisions relating to small parks contained in the act approved July 21, 1914, entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes," \$25,000.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 75 strike out lines 2 to 12, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "For the condemnation of small park areas to be acquired in accordance with the provisions relating to small parks in the District of Columbia, contained in the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, \$25,000."

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I had better say a word in relation to this amendment. It is offered in order that the language may conform with the law in the last sundry civil appropriation act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 19422) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to its final passage.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the first amendment to the bill.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the other amendments be adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will submit the balance in gross.

There was no demand for a separate vote on any other amendment, and all the amendments except the first were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the first amendment.

Mr. MANN. And on that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 1, by striking out the words "one half of," in line 3; and the words "out of the money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia," in lines 4, 5, and 6; and the word "namely," in line 9, all on page 1, and insert the following as an amendment thereto: "That all moneys appropriated for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia shall be paid out of the revenues of said District to the extent that they are available, and the balance shall be paid out of money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, but the amount to be paid from the Treasury of the United States shall in no event be as much as one-half of said expenses, and all laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed."



The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.  
The question was taken; and there were—yeas 186, nays 100, answered "present" 4, not voting 138, as follows:

## YEAS—186.

Abercrombie	Difenderfer	Jacoway	Rubey
Adair	Donovan	Johnson, Ky.	Rucker
Adamson	Doolittle	Johnson, S. C.	Russell
Aiken	Doughton	Keating	Sabath
Allen	Eagle	Kelly, Pa.	Saunders
Anderson	Edwards	Kennedy, Conn.	Shackelford
Ashbrook	Evans	Kettner	Sherley
Aswell	Fergusson	Key, Ohio	Sherwood
Bailey	Ferris	Kindel	Sinnott
Baker	Fields	Kirkpatrick	Sisson
Barkley	FitzHenry	Kitchin	Slayden
Barnhart	Flood, Va.	La Follette	Small
Bartlett	Floyd, Ark.	Lazaro	Smith, Tex.
Barton	Foster	Lenroot	Stafford
Bathrick	Fowler	Leshner	Stanley
Bell, Cal.	Francis	Lever	Stedman
Bell, Ga.	Garner	Lieb	Stephens, Cal.
Booher	Garrett, Tex.	Lindbergh	Stephens, Miss.
Borchers	Gill	Linthicum	Stephens, Nebr.
Borland	Godwin, N. C.	Lobeck	Stephens, Tex.
Brockson	Goeke	Loneragan	Stone
Brumbaugh	Goodwin, Ark.	McAndrews	Stout
Buchanan, Ill.	Gordon	McGillcuddy	Summers
Bulkeley	Goulden	McKellar	Taggart
Burgess	Graham, Ill.	MacDonald	Tayner
Burke, Wis.	Gray	Maguire, Nebr.	Taylor, Ark.
Burnett	Green, Iowa	Manahan	Taylor, Colo.
Byrnes, S. C.	Gudger	Mapes	Thomas
Byrns, Tenn.	Hamlin	Mitchell	Thompson, Okla.
Callaway	Hardy	Moon	Townsend
Candler, Miss.	Harris	Morgan, La.	Tribble
Cantrill	Harrison	Morgan, Okla.	Tuttle
Caraway	Haugen	Moss, Ind.	Vaughan
Carter	Hayden	Mulkey	Vinson
Casey	Heflin	Murray	Vollmer
Church	Helm	Neely, W. Va.	Walker
Clark, Fla.	Helvering	Oldfield	Walsh
Collier	Henry	Page, N. C.	Webb
Connelly, Kans.	Hensley	Palmer	Whaley
Cox	Holland	Park	White
Cramton	Houston	Peterson	Wingo
Crisp	Howard	Phelan	Witherspoon
Crosser	Hoxworth	Quin	Woodruff
Cullop	Hughes, Ga.	Rauch	Young, N. Dak.
Decker	Hulings	Rayburn	Young, Tex.
Dickinson	Hull	Reed	
Dies	Igoe	Rouse	

## NAYS—100.

Alexander	Farr	Lee, Pa.	Scott
Anthony	Frear	Lindquist	Sells
Austin	French	Lloyd	Slemp
Barchfield	Gallagher	McKenzie	Sloan
Bartholdt	Gardner	McLaughlin	Smith, Idaho
Beakes	Gillett	Madden	Smith, J. M. C.
Blackmon	Good	Mann	Smith, Minn.
Broussard	Greene, Vt.	Miller	Smith, N. Y.
Browning	Hawley	Mondell	Steenerson
Bryan	Hay	Montague	Stevens, Minn.
Butler	Hayes	Moss, W. Va.	Stringer
Campbell	Helgesen	Nelson	Switzer
Carlin	Howell	Padgett	Taylor, Ala.
Clancy	Hughes, W. Va.	Paige, Mass.	Temple
Copley	Humphrey, Wash.	Parker, N. J.	Thacher
Curry	Humphreys, Miss.	Patton, Pa.	Towner
Danforth	Johnson, Utah	Peters	Treadway
Davis	Johnson, Wash.	Plumley	Vare
Deitrick	Kelley, Mich.	Post	Volstead
Dent	Kennedy, Iowa	Powers	Watson
Dillon	Kennedy, R. I.	Ragsdale	Weaver
Donohoe	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Raker	Williams
Edmonds	Knowland, J. R.	Roberts, Mass.	Willis
Esch	Langham	Roberts, Nev.	Winslow
Falconer	Langley	Rogers	Woods

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Burke, S. Dak.	Cline	Kahn	Lee, Ga.
----------------	-------	------	----------

## NOT VOTING—138.

Alney	Dooling	Griffin	Maher
Ansberry	Doremus	Guernsey	Martin
Avis	Driscoll	Hamill	Metz
Baltz	Drukker	Hamilton, Mich.	Moore
Beall, Tex.	Dunn	Hamilton, N. Y.	Morin
Bowdie	Dupré	Hammond	Morrison
Britten	Eagan	Hart	Mott
Brodbeck	Elder	Hill	Murdoch
Brown, N. Y.	Estopinal	Hinds	Neeley, Kans.
Brown, W. Va.	Fairchild	Hinebaugh	Nolan, J. I.
Browne, Wis.	Falson	Hobson	Norton
Bruckner	Fess	Jones	O'Brien
Buchanan, Tex.	Finley	Keister	Oglesby
Burke, Pa.	Fitzgerald	Kent	O'Hair
Calder	Fordney	Kiess, Pa.	O'Leary
Canter	Gallivan	Kinkaid, N. J.	O'Shaunessy
Carew	Gard	Konop	Parker, N. Y.
Carr	Garrett, Tenn.	Korby	Patten, N. Y.
Cary	George	Kreider	Platt
Chandler, N. Y.	Gerry	Lafferty	Porter
Claypool	Gilmore	L'Engle	Pou
Coady	Gittins	Levy	Price
Connolly, Iowa	Glass	Lewis, Md.	Prouty
Conry	Goldfogle	Lewis, Pa.	Rainey
Cooper	Gorman	Loft	Reilly, Conn.
Davenport	Graham, Pa.	Logue	Reilly, Wis.
Dershem	Greene, Mass.	McClellan	Riordan
Dixon	Griegst	McGuire, Okla.	Rothermel
		Mahan	Rupley

Scully	Sparkman	Ten Eyck	Watkins
Seldomridge	Stevens, N. H.	Thomson, Ill.	Whitacre
Shreve	Sutherland	Underhill	Wilson, Fla.
Sims	Talbot, Md.	Underwood	Wilson, N. Y.
Smith, Md.	Talcott, N. Y.	Wallin	
Smith, Saml. W.	Taylor, N. Y.	Walters	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. SHREVE.  
Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. KAHN.  
Mr. DALE with Mr. MARTIN.  
Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. HOWARD with Mr. FAIRCHILD.  
Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. CARY.  
Mr. SCULLY with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.  
Mr. BROWN of New York with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. CALDER.  
Mr. UNDERWOOD with Mr. FORDNEY.  
Mr. WATKINS with Mr. AINEY.  
Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. AVIS.  
Mr. BROWN of West Virginia with Mr. BRITTEN.  
Mr. BRUCKNER with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.  
Mr. CARR with Mr. COOPER.  
Mr. CLAYPOOL with Mr. DEUKKER.  
Mr. COADY with Mr. DUNN.  
Mr. CONRY with Mr. GRIEST.  
Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. GUERNSEY.  
Mr. DIXON with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.  
Mr. NEELEY of Kansas with Mr. NORTON.  
Mr. DOOLING with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.  
Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. HINDS.  
Mr. DUPRÉ with Mr. HINEBAUGH.  
Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. KEISTER.  
Mr. FINLEY with Mr. KREIDER.  
Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.  
Mr. GERRY with Mr. MOORE.  
Mr. GLASS with Mr. MORIN.  
Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. MOTT.  
Mr. HART with Mr. J. I. NOLAN.  
Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. PARKER.  
Mr. POU with Mr. PLATT.  
Mr. RAINEY with Mr. PORTER.  
Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.  
Mr. WHITACRE with Mr. SUTHERLAND.  
Mr. JONES with Mr. WALLIN.

On the vote:

Mr. PROUTY (for amendment) with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota (against).

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin (for amendment) with Mr. FESS (against).

Mr. AVIS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening?

Mr. AVIS. No; I was out in the lobby.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening?

Mr. ANSBERRY. I was right on the edge of the gallery, Mr. Speaker; I do not know whether that is considered in the Hall or not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Mr. Speaker, if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "no."

The SPEAKER. It does not make any difference how the gentleman would vote; he can not vote.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 19909) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government (H. Rept. 1221), which was read the first and second times and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa reserves all points of order on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for general debate on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and pending that I would like to see if we can agree upon a time for general debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky objects.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina moves, notwithstanding the rule that requires a day for printing, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union—

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. And pending that, I would like to see if we can agree upon a time for general debate.

Mr. GOOD. How much time would the gentleman from South Carolina suggest?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Would the gentleman be satisfied with an hour and a quarter on a side?

Mr. GOOD. No; I have requests for more time than that, but I would suggest that we take up the bill and agree upon four hours' general debate—that would consume the day—as we can not take up the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule, anyway, to-day.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, very well; I will agree upon four hours, two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] and two hours by myself. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, pending the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, general debate be confined to four hours, two hours to a side, two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa and two hours by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina moves, notwithstanding the rule that requires a bill be printed one day in advance—

Mr. MANN. There is no such rule.

The SPEAKER. But the bill has never been printed. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and pending that he asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to four hours, two hours to be controlled by himself and two hours by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good]. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider this bill.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 19909, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. FOSTER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19909) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Gillett].

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, to-day all over the world individuals, institutions, and Governments are endeavoring to curtail their expenditures and reduce their obligations, because they recognize it as a period of stringency and reduced income. As I listened to the President's message I thought that he felt the spirit of the time and was inculcating upon us the economy which everyone else is practicing. I have since read several times that portion of his message, and while it has the charm which invariably characterizes his speeches to Congress, I find it has also a quality of vagueness and indefiniteness which is almost as invariable, and while he introduces this subject by saying that "it is highly important that our judgments should be clear, definite, and steadfast," yet I think the most extreme advocate of a huge pork-barrel appropriation bill or the strict-

est economist could with equal effect quote in their support the President's attractive phrases. It seems to me that the times demand not simply a vague intention to avoid increased extravagance but an immediate reduction of expenses, a pruning of all nonessentials, a postponement of whatever is not indispensable. We were told at the last session that our revenues were so precarious that special taxes must be imposed. Such emergency taxes should be used for emergencies, and the Government should not in such times of stress continue living on the same scale as in times of ease and prosperity and a full Treasury. Perhaps one reason the Democratic platforms have always preached economy and tried to make that seem a Democratic principle is because they realized that economy was more necessary and imperative in Democratic times than in Republican times. I assent to that theory, and I believe in the typical Democratic time of to-day a strict and unsparing economy is necessary.

But in studying the estimate, I see little indication of any such purpose in this administration. You would think we were in the midst of plenty. Instead of economizing and reducing expenses the administration asks for more money than we ever spent up to last year, and as you study the figures you find that some of the reductions are not real ones and that the estimates really call for more than last year, which was the high tide of national expenditure, and this at a time when everyone else in the world is lopping off expenses and when we are paying most onerous and vexatious emergency taxes.

The regular estimates last year were \$1,108,000,000; this year they are \$1,090,000,000, an apparent reduction of \$18,000,000. But the Secretary of the Treasury tells us—page 58 of his report—that the estimate for the Postal Service under existing laws is \$320,000,000, but if the legislation recommended by the department is enacted the cost will be only \$297,000,000, a saving of \$23,000,000. He refers, I suppose, to the change from rural carriers to star-route service, and accordingly, in the Book of Estimates, he figures the cost of the Postal Service as \$297,000,000. Under existing law, which is the basis on which the estimates should be figured, that should be \$23,000,000 larger, and the apparent reduction of \$18,000,000 over last year is wiped out, and these estimates supplant those of last year as the largest sum any administration has ever asked any Congress to appropriate. That seems to be the interpretation in administration figures of the meaning of the paragraph about economy in the President's message. That means that in this time of depression and suffering the administration recommends that the Government be run on a more lavish and expensive scale than ever before in its history. I think that, on the contrary, now is a time to pare close to the lowest possible limit.

You gentlemen know probably better than the administration whether that legislation reducing the Post Office appropriations \$23,000,000 will go through or not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Post Office Committee has reported a bill negating the recommendation of the department and appropriates a total of \$322,000,000?

Mr. GILLETT. I was not aware of that fact, but I was perfectly confident that that would be the fact. If the gentleman says it is \$322,000,000, there is \$25,000,000 already reported larger on the Post Office bill than it is estimated for. So that the estimates, instead of being \$18,000,000 less than last year, are really \$7,000,000 larger, and that in this period of stress and depression.

Mr. MANN. Would it divert the gentleman if he yielded to me for a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly not.

Mr. MANN. What are the total estimates of appropriations and the total estimates of receipts for the next fiscal year?

Mr. GILLETT. The total estimates of appropriations are \$1,080,000,000, calling the Post Office bill \$297,000,000.

Mr. MANN. What is the total estimate of receipts made by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. GILLETT. There are about seven hundred and odd millions without the Post Office bill. They are about the same as the expenditures.

Mr. MANN. I have not examined the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, but I saw a newspaper statement the other day that the estimates of receipts were about \$60,000,000 less than the estimates submitted of expenditures. If so, of course the administration has not complied with the law as carried in the Smith amendment.

Mr. GILLETT. I think they make the receipts equal the expenditures by this unjustified reduction of the \$25,000,000 in Post Office expenses and by deducting the \$60,000,000 of the



sinking fund, and they also subtract the \$18,000,000 for Panama, which I assume they expect to pay out of bonds instead of paying it out of current receipts, as we have been doing for many years.

Mr. MANN. They do not comply with the law that requires the President, when he makes estimates of receipts and expenditures, if the expenditures exceed the receipts, to make recommendation as to the methods of raising additional money. That is the law. Possibly they have not discovered it up there yet.

Mr. GILLET. It seems to me, as I study the figures and the Secretary of the Treasury's report, that there is staring us in the face a tremendous deficit not only in 1916 but in this very fiscal year, and that the narrowest economy is our plain duty.

The Secretary says in his report:

The European war seriously and adversely affected the revenues of the Government from imports. The revenue from customs for the month of October, 1914, was \$16,000,000 and for the month of October, 1913, it was \$30,000,000, showing a decrease in one month of \$14,000,000. I have taken the month of October for the purpose of comparison, as the new tariff went into effect October, 1913, and duties were therefore the same. The reduction in revenues is due solely to the falling off in importations.

But if you look at the statement of the Department of Commerce for the month which the Secretary selects for his comparison you find that the importations in October did not fall off at all, but increased. For October, 1913, they were \$133,000,000 and for the month of October, 1914, they were \$138,000,000. And yet the Secretary of the Treasury says:

The reduction in revenues is due solely to the falling off in importations.

How can he make a statement which the figures of his fellow Cabinet officer so absolutely contradict? If he is so wrong in his reasoning there it increases one's suspicion that he is wrong when he attributes our diminished revenues to the European war rather than to the Democratic tariff.

He goes on to say:

To keep the Treasury in strong condition in these abnormal times was obviously the first duty of the hour. Upon it largely depended the safety of business and finance in this country. If the emergency revenue act had not been passed, the surplus in the Treasury would have constantly diminished and might have disappeared altogether.

Inasmuch as that surplus has shrunk from \$145,000,000 on the 1st of last July to \$74,000,000 to-day, the danger which the Secretary points out is a very real one, and inasmuch as the emergency revenue is only estimated at \$54,000,000 for the rest of this year, an apprehension is not unreasonable that even with the emergency revenues our Treasury may be dangerously empty before the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will it embarrass the gentleman to ask him a question right there?

Mr. GILLET. It will not embarrass me. I only hate to take so much time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee whether the revenues returned under the emergency act passed two months ago have been brought into the Treasury and added in the daily returns?

Mr. GILLET. I can not tell the gentleman; but we have this fact—which should be considered and which makes us even more concerned about the Treasury—that during this administration the expenditures have always run in excess of the estimates made by the administration and the revenue has always been below their estimates; so that it seems to me the outlook for this fiscal year is very blue, even under the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury himself. He says:

As long as the expenditures of the Government exceed its income there is always danger. To maintain such a condition is both unsound and imprudent. The corollary of a weak Treasury is impaired confidence.

I heartily indorse these sentiments, and it seems to me they should naturally have led to a cutting down of the estimates, and that instead of recommending expenditures on a vaster scale than ever before suggestions of a reduction should have been made.

He says:

It is, I think, unfortunate that this emergency measure is made to expire December, 1915. I venture to suggest that this limitation should be removed and the act amended so as to provide that it shall remain in force until peace is restored in Europe.

A more logical suggestion would have been that it remain in force until the Democratic tariff is repealed. In times of depression the people do not submit cheerfully to unusual and vexatious taxation, and it seems to me it would have been more natural and satisfactory for the administration to have recommended that this Government do what the rest of us are doing—cut down expenses—and even then, and with the emergency revenues, I do not believe the Treasury would be any too strong.

I understand that the revenues of the Post Office Department are falling off, and, as the Secretary has pointed out, in such

times we should run no risks. That there is no disposition even now to stint is shown by the fact that on the very first day of the session four different recommendations, in addition to the regular estimates, amounting to over \$4,000,000, were made, besides deficiency estimates of several millions.

It is always difficult to decide what is extravagance, what is economy, what is parsimony—men's minds will differ—but it seems to me clear that in times like these, as depicted by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the revenues decreasing, the surplus diminishing, importations uncertain, and when a full Treasury is indispensable, it is extravagant to send in estimates which show no serious attempt at retrenchment.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to avail myself of the latitude of general debate to make a few observations not germane to this bill.

During the last campaign a member of the Cabinet came to my home city to address a Democratic rally, and in language too caustic for me to care to advertise it by repeating it denounced me because of my partisanship. I had a great regard and respect for the gentleman, and though it was naturally somewhat diminished by his uncomplimentary remarks and poor judgment of me, it was not extinguished; and it has occurred to me that it would be a fair retaliation to his criticism to show by a few specimens that the administration of which he is a distinguished and ornamental part had committed acts of partisanship beside which anything I had done would look like austere and judicial impartiality.

Partisanship is not a crime, but there are degrees of it—some commendable, some pardonable, some inexcusable. My partisanship I naturally think belongs to the first class, for I understand it consists in criticizing the Democratic administration, and inasmuch as Republicans in this Congress have been deprived of all effectual participation in legislation by the secret caucus system of the Democrats, it would be hard if they could not indulge in the only weapon left them—debate. But I think I can cite plenty of instances of partisanship by this administration which clearly belong to the third degree—inexcusable.

The very appearance of the gentleman so far from the scene of his duty for the purpose of belaboring and defeating Republicans was hardly the act of a nonpartisan, and he added to the partisanship of it by taking along with him from his duties another official, the collector of customs in New York, who did not know me, but who spent an hour in criticizing me in what I was told was a very entertaining and eloquent and effective speech.

The collector of the port of New York receives the largest salary of any United States official in the country outside of Washington. Formerly the collector was looked upon as the head of a New York machine, and his thousands of subordinates were considered an organized army for the party in power; but of late years that abominable system has been abolished, the force has been put under civil service, and the last collector found sufficient scope for his great abilities in watching and administering the interests of the Government. When the present collector was installed by this administration I noticed that he published in the papers that while in office hours he should attend to public business; his other hours would be devoted to politics—a broad hint to his subordinates and an apparent effort to again establish the collector as a party boss.

I do not believe the Government would get any more than its money's worth if the collector devoted all his time to the duties of the office instead of going out of the State in vain attempts to defeat Republicans; but apparently this was no unusual incident, for I remember a Democratic Congressman from the President's own State felt obliged to introduce a resolution in Congress asking the Secretary of the Treasury to tell how he could secure a reply to letters from the collector and where his office was located and what were his hours for conducting public business, and the health officer of New York—another good Democrat—retorting upon the collector, cruelly said:

The health officer of the State of New York wishes to state that he is not running his department from a summer resort or in the newspapers.

Now, I am perfectly willing that a member of the Cabinet and the collector of the port of New York should abandon their official duties and go up to my district to defeat me—particularly in view of the result—but I must be excused for thinking that it does not make a good introduction to a speech denouncing me for partisanship.

Let me refer to a few acts of this administration which I think are not commendable or excusable, but are unpardonable acts of partisanship, and which I think ought to estop members

of the administration from criticizing others for that disposition.

By the new banking act the Reserve Board was given enormous power over the financial interests of the country. It would not seem reasonable that all seven of the members of that board should belong to one party, and if any administration—particularly one which represented a minority of the voters—should select the whole seven from its own followers, I think it might be defined as an act of narrow and inexcusable partisanship. All of the seven originally selected for the present board were Democrats. One of them, you remember, was not confirmed by the Senate because he had the manliness to repudiate the special plea made for him by the President that he became a director of an indicted trust in order to reform it. That left a vacancy, to which another Democrat was promptly nominated. So the administration made eight selections for the board, and every one of them was a Democrat. As far as we can judge, it would have made no difference how many the board contained, they would all be Democrats. The duties and power of the board make it particularly desirable and natural that it should be nonpartisan—that all appearance of partisanship should be avoided. I am told that at the bankers' convention, when considering the proposed law, the suggestion was made that it should contain a provision that the minority party should always have representation on the board, but they all thought that no administration would ever show such bigoted partisanship as not to recognize its opponents on the board, and so the motion was withdrawn as superfluous. And yet this administration selected eight members for this board at the most crucial formative period of its existence, and every one of them was a Democrat. Should such an administration denounce others for partisanship?

One member of the Reserve Board has already given an instance both of his power and of his partisanship. A Democratic Senator of a Southern State, whose record for paying its obligations was not stainless, complained to the Secretary of the Treasury that his State was not able to borrow \$1,000,000 in New York on satisfactory terms. A borrower with a bad record often finds terms unsatisfactory, especially in periods of financial disturbance. But the Secretary of the Treasury issued a public statement that if the Senator could not raise the loan on satisfactory terms, "I will myself see if banks can not be found to take up this loan." With that threat and by an inducement in the shape of a deposit of United States funds it was not strange that he quickly found an accommodating bank. The Democratic national platform said:

We condemn the present methods of depositing Government funds in a few favored banks, and we pledge our party to provide by law for their deposit by competitive bidding.

The Secretary of the Treasury not only deposits in a favored bank, but he favors the bank in order to induce it to lend money to his political friends. Is such an administration in a position to criticize partisanship? When their party is the beneficiary their national platform is but a scrap of paper.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say to the gentleman that the loan to which he refers was granted for the purpose of helping out a Republican administration in the State of Tennessee rather than a political friend.

Mr. GILLETT. It was a Democratic Senator who came and asked for it. I believe temporarily the State of Tennessee did happen to have a Republican governor, but he was not the agent who went to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There are many others in the State of Tennessee who think the fact that the loan was needed was because Tennessee had a Republican governor.

Mr. GILLETT. I know nothing about the local conditions. Did you have a Republican legislature, too?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, yes; we had what was called a fusion legislature.

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know anything about your local politics. I only know what I saw in the paper—that it was a Democratic Senator, and that it was at his urgent insistence that it was granted.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is it not quite probable that this bribe which was given by the Secretary of the Treasury to a Democratic Senator was one of the reasons for the State of Tennessee recently going Democratic?

Mr. GILLETT. Another specimen of the nonpartisanship of this administration is furnished by its conduct toward fourth-class postmasters. An Executive order was issued by the President setting aside the orders of Presidents Roosevelt and Taft which had covered all fourth-class postmasters into the civil service, and this new order provided that the postmasters al-

ready holding office must submit to a competitive examination. This order was accepted by Congress as a satisfactory substitute for its proposition to return all fourth-class postmasters into the old patronage system, and apparently they have not been disappointed in their expectations of its practical workings. Suspiciously contemporaneous with this order came a reorganization of the Civil Service Commission by whom this new examination of the postmasters was to be made.

In the 20 years that I have been here appointments to that commission have been singularly free from any taint or charge of partisanship. The law provides that the commission shall consist of three persons, not more than two of whom shall be adherents of the same political party. As the main purpose of the commission was to eliminate partisanship from appointments, care was taken that the commission itself should not be partisan. That spirit was so recognized and obeyed throughout the administrations of Presidents Roosevelt and Taft that two of the three commissioners, including the president of the board, were Democrats, although the administrations that appointed them and retained them and had full power of removal were Republican. Ever since Theodore Roosevelt resigned from the commission in 1895 the president of the commission has been a Democrat, and during these administrations no changes occurred in the board except by the voluntary resignation of a commissioner. But although two of the three commissioners were Democrats, this administration in its eagerness for patronage at once removed two of them, one Republican and one Democrat. It is not often that an administration can dispose for a useful partisan purpose of an office which must be filled by a member of the opposite party, but the Republican commissioner, whom I had always found an exceptionally able and efficient official, was removed and his place filled by a constituent of a Progressive Senator, and that Senator's vote has supported administration measures more reliably than many Democrats. Gratitude has been defined as a lively appreciation of favors to come, and I presume the Senator secured the appointment of his constituent by appealing to the gratitude of the administration.

The place of the Democrat who was removed was given to the secretary of a Senator from South Carolina, whose training as the political representative of his employer one would not expect to fit him preeminently for this nonpartisan position.

This reorganized commission proceeded with its appointed task of examining fourth-class postmasters, and then the administration made the appointments. The law forbids that in the selection political faith shall be even considered. It is a violation of the law to select a man or be influenced in the selection by his politics. Do you think that either the letter or spirit of the law has been observed? To be legal here the administration must be nonpartisan. Do you think it has been either nonpartisan or legal? Let me cite two cases from my own district which recently came to my notice. In one town two men took the examination for postmaster. One was a Republican who had held the office for many years; who had the respect and confidence of the whole town; who had a long petition signed by many Democrats as well as Republicans. The rival candidate was a Democrat backed by no petition of his fellow citizens. I was told that only one man in the town besides himself wanted his appointment, but that may have been an exaggeration. The Republican was marked 90 on his examination and the Democrat 83. Did the Republican, who had the highest mark, in addition to his experience and his petition, receive the office? Oh, no; it was given to the Democrat. And yet the law demands that partisan considerations shall be ignored.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does not the law in reference to the civil service require that the three highest on the eligible list shall be certified, and from those three highest the Postmaster General, or the head of the department, shall select one of the three?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes; but the law forbids in making that selection the consideration of politics.

Mr. BARTLETT. Probably politics were not considered in the gentleman's case.

Mr. GILLETT. That is where I differ from the gentleman from Georgia. I do not believe that politics were not considered, and neither do I believe the gentleman believes it.

Mr. BARTLETT. The fact that he was a Democrat ought to give him a majority in this administration.

Mr. GILLETT. Probably it does; and that is where I say that the Democratic administration is not only partisan but illegal, because the law makes it illegal to take into consideration the politics of the candidate.



In another neighboring place the Republican, who had held the office for a dozen years, ranked three points higher than his opponent in the examination, but he was turned down and his Democratic rival given the place.

That process is going on in all our districts, and yet they criticize us for being partisan, when they are showing their bigoted partisanship not only in ignoring the rank in examination, but in violating the law, which forbids considering a man's politics. I can at least assert that my partisanship has never prevented me from advocating every extension of the merit system and every lessening of Congressional patronage, much less has it led me to flagrant disregard of the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. How does the gentleman explain the fact that under the Republican administration 97 per cent of all the civil-service appointees were Republicans?

Mr. GILLETT. It was not so. That is the way I explain that. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. One question more, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. GILLETT. I will yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. How does the gentleman explain away the fact that out of 400 post-office inspectors only 32 were Democrats?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not believe that is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was so.

Mr. MANN. That was not so.\*

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Is it not true that most of the post-office inspectors are now Democrats, or claim to be?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know, but that is aside from the point I am making. What I am saying is that under this civil-service law all over the country the same sort of thing is going on—not only is the administration partisan, but its partisanship leads them to perform acts that are illegal. I do not think it lies in the mouth of this administration to condemn for partisanship men who criticize it.

The selection of ambassadors has always been partisan and personal. Although I have always favored putting our whole Diplomatic Service on a merit basis and promoting as a reward for efficiency, yet I have never thought it was vital, because it seemed to me that in these days of cables and wireless an ambassador was only the mouthpiece of an administration, and his personal ability was of no great moment if he creditably upheld the dignity of his country. The present war has led me to revise my opinion in this as in some other matters. It teaches me how valuable it might be to a country to have an ambassador who had friendly and intimate personal relations with the leading men of the country to which he was accredited, and who could analyze accurately their prevalent opinions and purposes. How invaluable to Germany, for instance, last summer to know exactly the purposes and probable action of England and Italy. But ordinarily an ambassador's duties and opportunities are less important. During the trying times of this war our foreign representatives have met with ability and wisdom the unusual emergencies. I do not think, however, it is partisanship which makes me feel that one above all the others has distinguished himself and won the unlimited admiration and gratitude both of the people among whom he was stationed and of his own fellow countrymen. With no desire to disparage anyone, I think Ambassador Herrick won for himself a unique position, and we all in this country may take pride in the fact that when the French Government fled from Paris it was to our representative that President Poincaré said: "I commit to your charge the people of Paris." [Applause on the Republican side.] He had won a position of distinction and usefulness which fortune seldom permits to any man, and it was with great regret that I learned of his recall. I have the warmest regard and respect for his successor. We learned in this House to appreciate his ability, his refinement, his courtesy. But Gov. Herrick has attained such an unusual prestige that I felt he might well have been retained until the emergency was over, and this feeling was vastly intensified when the current rumor reached me that he was withdrawn not in the ordinary routine, but because of selfish partisanship, because Ohio politicians demanded it, because Gov. Herrick was rendering too splendid service, was making America and himself too useful, was making himself a too popular and dangerous opponent, and so the very glory of his service was the secret and vital reason of his recall. And yet an administration which can stoop to this rebukes others for being partisan.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. What basis has the gentleman for that statement?

Mr. GILLETT. That is current report; I have it on very good basis, and I thoroughly believe it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does not the gentleman think that, making a charge of that kind, in view of the fact that the present ambassador had been appointed months before and was over in France, he ought to give something more than rumor as the basis for his statement?

Mr. GILLETT. It has something more than rumor for its basis.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then let us have it.

Mr. GILLETT. I can not give it, and will not give it; but I believe it is true, and I do not believe it will be contradicted by those who know about it.

That heroic old Democrat whose birthday is still celebrated by his degenerate party descendants, Andrew Jackson, is said to have asked a friend who was urging him to give an office to an editor in New York, "Does he loyally support me?" To which the friend replied, "He always supports you when he thinks you are right." The prototype of Democracy responded, "That's just when I can get along without him. What I want is a friend who will support me when he knows I am wrong." I presume that orthodox Democratic doctrine is held by this administration. Of course its friends will be kept very busy if they support it whenever they know it is wrong, but I have no doubt the rewards will be convincing and sufficient. But I do not think the text for its speeches should be the offensive partisanship of its opponents. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is very proper that I should follow the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] who has just spoken, because I, too, was selected for the attention of a distinguished member of the Cabinet, who traveled not 300 miles, as he did to Massachusetts, but over 1,300 miles, up into my own district, in order to tell my people whom they ought to support. It is needless to say it was not a Republican candidate whose candidacy he urged. I may further suggest that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] who has just spoken did what he could for this administration prior to adjournment by holding up to public gaze the extravagant appropriations which had been made and suggesting that public economy ought to be practiced at this time. In a smaller and in an humble way I, too, endeavored to do what I could to save an extravagant appropriation by this administration.

In the river and harbor bill which passed the House at forty-three million, some of you may remember I endeavored to point out imperfections and defects which, in my judgment, ought to have defeated it. But that bill went over to the Senate and there had added to it \$10,000,000 more, making a total of \$53,000,000. After a long period the bill was defeated, and a substitute bill carrying \$20,000,000 was passed, which with the \$6,990,000 carried by the sundry civil appropriation bill made \$27,000,000 appropriated for waterways at the last session. We were criticized at that time for being niggardly over waterways, when, as a matter of fact, that amount was almost equal to the total appropriations 10 years ago, for the years 1904 and 1905. But I had no expectation of discussing that phase of the subject at this time. The argument which was raised when that bill was before the House, in response to every criticism of every project, was that the Army engineers had approved the project, that they had passed upon it, and that therefore Congress was supposed to accept it without any further questioning. I realize that when the new bill comes before the House time will be extremely limited, and for that reason I do not desire to encroach upon the time of the committee, excepting under the five-minute rule, if I may then be permitted; but I desire at this time to briefly point out to the House why the judgment of Army engineers ought not to be taken at its reported value. I believe that they have indorsed, within the past year, one of the most objectionable propositions ever brought before the American people so far as Government support is concerned, and that it is not the only one with which they have been connected, in my judgment. In order that I may not misstate any of the facts in regard to their position I desire to present one or more projects which they have approved, giving reasons for their approval, and I ask your attention to those reasons.

Before doing so, however, I desire to refer to another matter connected with river and harbor appropriations.

No public-spirited man questions the policy of extending Government aid to legitimate waterway improvements. No well-informed man can also close his eyes to scores of scandalous projects that receive many millions of dollars annually from Government waterway appropriations. No thinking man should

support a miserable, wasteful pork barrel because of some legitimate project it contains.

At the lobby carnival held in this city last week, I am informed, opponents to the lobby's wasteful policy were severely criticized. The same expression of indignation came from the railway lobby of my own State 10 years ago, when the State legislature demanded to know what returns the people were getting for their money. There we were met with the same denunciation and misrepresentation, the weapons of the lobby.

I have shown to the House by RECORD evidence that dredgers, railways, and contractors are contributing to the support of the \$50,000,000 river and harbor lobby. All these facts were set forth in the RECORD for October 8. Why will not men occupying conspicuous positions in both Congress and the river and harbor lobby insist upon an investigation? Let it be thorough and include the opposition as well. Why do we investigate Mulhall and not the river and harbor lobby? Why do we investigate conditions in West Virginia, Michigan, and Colorado mines and yet ignore national scandal at our doors? Why do we investigate the promotion of a gold mine in North Carolina and yet refuse to dig into the looting of a Federal Treasury that is annually worked by water-power interests, land reclamationists, railways, dredgers, and contractors who demand an annual \$50,000,000 "barrel."

Good-intentioned people who are inveigled into this greedy combination may well inquire into the character of the organization.

A yellow-colored circular was mailed to every Member of Congress last week, on both sides of which appeared the sensational statement:

War has been declared against the waterways of the United States. This foolish and barefaced misstatement, an insult to the intelligence of every Representative, was sent to all of us over the signature of the river and harbor lobby's president and secretary.

The yellow document contained a pathetic appeal for the largest convention ever held by the lobby, and in bold, black type was an announcement that "the President of the United States has been invited to speak." That brought the crowd. But the President did not appear, neither did the Kaiser nor the Sultan of Sulu, for good and sufficient reasons. But the virtues of several lame-duck projects that had been repudiated by Congress were extolled by fervid orators to willing ears, and it was unanimously resolved to support an annual \$50,000,000 Treasury raid.

Think of the proposal: In the presence of a huge war tax, of a President's plea for economy, of a defeated infamous "pork barrel," and of the lobby's exposed efforts to roll it through Congress this \$50,000,000 lobby demands \$50,000,000 more, to include scores of projects, shown to be "humbug and steals," masquerading as navigable waters.

On December 8 the fearless Chicago Tribune, one of the world's great newspapers, in a comprehensive editorial answered the lobby's declaration of war on the Treasury as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 8, 1914.]

#### IMPROVING NAVIGATION V. STEALING PUBLIC MONEY.

Throughout the United States navigation improvements are in danger of being prevented by their undisciplined advocates just as they were prevented in Illinois.

No informed person doubts that the reasonable waterway program of the State administration would have been put into effect before now but for the intemperate demands of an active clique, who disgusted the people of the State with the entire waterway propaganda.

At one time the Lakes to the Gulf Deep Waterway Association was an influential body. It included in its membership a large number of highly disinterested men, but it fell under the control of the fanatics, the "pork" hunters, the salaried secretaries, and disappeared into oblivion.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is in serious danger of traveling the same road.

An organization formed for the purpose of fostering healthy public sentiment and legitimate financial support for water navigation will find a ready response throughout the Nation. But an organization conducted for the purpose of lending nonpartisan and nonpolitical support to "pork-barrel" schemes in which water transportation has the least part and in which a raid upon the National Treasury is the leading motive will soon atrophy.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress, which meets in Washington to-morrow, will meet a hard test. Its president is an out-and-out "porker." Its salaried secretary is a hired demagogue, who has attempted to deceive the members of the congress to their own and the Nation's injury.

The "pork" representatives in the United States, in Congress, and before the Rivers and Harbors Congress have two planks in their platform.

Plank No. 1 is affirmative. There shall be dishonest river and harbor appropriations.

Plank No. 2 is negative. There shall be no honest appropriations without dishonest appropriations.

It has two battle cries.

In support of dishonest appropriation it attacks all critics as opposed to waterway improvements.

If defeated in its attempts to rob the Treasury, it attacks all legitimate improvements as extravagances.

It did both of these things to Illinois. It will do both of these things throughout the Nation.

The "porkers," fortunately, call attention to the navigation improvements of Europe.

In Europe great improvements have been obtained for water transportation at a minimum of cost. Taxes upon the transportation companies benefited defray the greater part of the expenses.

The river and harbor policy of the United States has been to obtain a minimum of benefit to navigation at a maximum of public expense. Where navigation has been benefited the navigation companies have been given the benefit free. They have become the beneficiaries of special privilege and discrimination. They take an active part in legislation and politics.

There are two main questions before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. First, will it be used as an instrument to pass the infamous "pork-barrel" bill rejected at the last session of Congress?

Second, can it organize itself into a body conducted for the benefit of navigation instead of being a body conducted to obtain Federal appropriations?

Its unorganized members may expect a hard drive from the gang who believe that the present Congress offers the last chance for large stealing and who are willing to sacrifice all future claims on public sympathy in waterway improvements for this one great prize.

A great part of the sincere workers for improved navigation are entirely taken in by the suave manners of the spoilsmen. They are in danger of being led to their own undoing.

If they participate in the deliberations of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, let them bear in mind that a large element of the Nation is already disgusted with anything going under the name of "river and harbor improvement."

There is another large element which is thoroughly disgusted with the extravagance of Congress, especially this Congress.

A little more greed, a little more "pork," and the Nation will turn away from navigation improvement for a generation to come.

The sincere and systematic workers for navigation improvement must discover that the way to obtain the results they are seeking is by a rigid elimination of "pork" in appropriation bills. This should be done through the medium of the existing organizations if possible. But if the existing organizations remain in control of the Treasury raiders, the sooner they are destroyed the sooner honest river and harbor improvements will come.

The Tribune speaks to over 300,000 daily readers. Its advice is valuable.

From New York comes this editorial utterance, which went to nearly a million subscribers of another high-class educational medium that in like manner hits hard at fakes and frauds:

[From Colliers, December 5, 1914.]

#### STILL HUNGRY FOR "PORK."

The staves and hoops are ready for the new river and harbor "pork barrel" which the backers of the discredited old method of appropriating Government money for waterways hope to shove through Congress this winter. Undismayed by the smashing a few weeks ago of the \$53,000,000 barrel—for which a lump sum of \$20,000,000, to be used at the discretion of the War Department's engineers, was substituted—distinguished "pork" getters and their friends are determined to obtain an appropriation of approximately \$45,000,000. They are going into the fight with the same arguments that have been used ever since the barrel was the size of a tomato can. For instance, the officials of the National River and Harbor Congress, in their call for an annual meeting to be held in Washington next week, characterize the condemnation heaped upon the present system as "a declaration of war on the whole policy of waterway improvement." Some of the members of the River and Harbor Congress may believe that statement; nobody else will. The people are more than willing to spend their money to facilitate water transportation, but are tired of seeing millions wasted on unusable creeks, rivers, and inlets. And the sooner the advocates of the pork-barrel system abandon it and insist upon the enactment of a law placing the river and harbor problem in the hands of a national commission, thereby removing it as far as possible from the reach of bartering politicians, the better it will be for all of us.

I could quote from other high-standard publications to the same effect, but now desire to present facts that every Member of Congress should examine for himself before voting away Government moneys for another scandalous measure.

On December 8 President Wilson said to Congress and to the country:

#### PRESIDENT WILSON ON NATIONAL ECONOMY.

It is not expenditure, but extravagance, that we should care being criticized for; not paying for the legitimate enterprises and undertakings of a great Government, whose people command what it should do, but adding what will benefit only a few or pouring money out for what need not have been undertaken at all or might have been postponed or better and more economically conceived and carried out. The Nation is not niggardly; it is very generous. It will chide us only if we forget for whom we pay money out and whose money it is we pay. These are large and general standards, but they are not very difficult of application to particular cases.

If a business man found his expenses in any branch of the business increasing out of all proportion to the returns, he would drive from his employ those who persist in wasteful extravagance.

No record of inefficiency in the entire Government service can equal that which greets us from a casual study of appropriations for rivers and harbors. In private business a general house cleaning would follow such an exposition. Why, then, should we as public servants, representing the interests of the people who pay the tax, adopt any different rule?

The history of a phenomenal decrease in navigation on inland waters, apart from traffic on the Great Lakes, is startling in character, but that decrease has been accompanied by reck-



less, wasteful expenditures that in recent years are being diverted into land reclamation, water power, and other schemes for private interests, as I have attempted to show in the past, and shall continue to present to those who make the appropriations.

The following statement, taken from Army engineers' reports, contains food for thought when we realize that a war tax in times of peace is not caused by European troubles but by inexcusable waste and inefficient management of our own affairs.

*River and harbor appropriations, 1875-1914.*

1875	\$5,218,000.00
1876	6,643,517.50
1877	5,015,000.00
1878	None made.
1879	8,201,700.00
1880	7,846,600.00
1881	8,951,500.00
1882	11,441,300.00
1883	18,738,875.00
1884	None made.
1885	13,949,200.00
1886	None made.
1887	14,473,900.00
1888	None made.
1889	22,397,616.90
1890	None made.
1891	25,136,295.00
1892	2,951,200.00
1893	21,068,218.00
1894	14,166,153.00
1895	20,043,180.00
1896	11,462,115.00
1897	16,244,147.00
1898	20,832,412.91
1899	14,627,449.56
1900	25,110,038.94
1901	16,285,605.75
1902	7,046,623.00
1903	32,540,199.50
1904	20,233,150.00
1905	10,872,200.00
1906	28,726,007.21
1907	17,252,052.04
1908	43,500,813.00
1909	18,092,945.00
1910	29,190,264.00
1911	49,380,541.50
1912	40,558,620.50
1913	51,115,889.00
1914	26,990,000.00

The force of the above table will be gained by comparisons. Taking biennial appropriations, in order to meet the former practice, we find—

1883	\$18,738,875
1884	
1893	36,134,371
1894	
1903	52,773,349
1904	
1913	78,105,889
1914	

A diminishing river traffic and a 400 per cent increase in appropriations in 30 years are facts that deserve serious consideration.

We should remember also that a reduction in the 1914 appropriation was brought about after widespread public protest had been dinned into the ears of Congress, coming as it did from the press throughout the country. The river and harbor bill of 1914, including new projects and sundry civil items, reached the astounding sum of \$93,000,000, a great part of which was waste. Notwithstanding the strenuous fight and secret back fire conducted by the rivers and harbors lobby during last session the barrel was smashed in the Senate and a \$20,000,000 fund was placed in the hands of the Army engineers for emergency work in addition to \$6,990,000 appropriated by the sundry civil bill.

*THE LOBBY DEMANDS ANOTHER \$50,000,000.*

Again the lobby has met and by resolution last week arrogantly demands of Congress another \$50,000,000. War taxes, national financial embarrassment, nothing weighs with the Treasury raiders, and I desire to show briefly on what projects a great part of the last \$53,000,000 barrel, and presumably the new bill, would be wasted.

Senator TILLMAN called the bill a "humbug and steal" many years ago, when the principle was the same but the amount of loot was far less. Yet never before has the lobby audaciously demanded a \$50,000,000 direct tax in order to float its barrel. That remained for the present administration to face. Avoided during the last session it devolved upon a handful of high-minded, courageous men in the Senate to save the country \$66,000,000 by their defeat of that waterway fraud. All honor to them and to a fearless press that became aroused and supported the fight.

I desire to discuss some projects frankly and impersonally, and for those who care to pursue their own investigation on the subject I ask attention to speeches relating to different phases of the 1914 bill, found in the Record for April 10, June 3, June 8, June 19, and October 8, together with many illuminating discussions in the Senate last session. It is a large subject to try and cover, but the enormous amount of annual loot taken from the Treasury, together with the acknowledged stultifying influences of the barrel, justifies a careful scrutiny by every Representative into scores of indefensible items that have made up the larger part of annual waterway bills.

I desire to particularly discuss one project that has been recommended by Army engineers for immediate construction and received a preliminary appropriation in the last bill, a project so vicious and scandalous in character that the country has reason to demand a full explanation for such recommendation. Possibly an attempt will be made to railroad the project through Congress at this session or commit us to a vicious policy, and as only a few minutes will be given by the committee to the discussion of any one item when the bill is before us the present time affords my only means of setting forth the true character of this project in advance of the bill's passage.

*WHAT THE BILL MEANS.*

Vote for such bills if you will, but vote understanding they are spurious waterway bills largely devoted to private water-power, land-reclamation, and other schemes, behind which are grouped dredgers, contractors, land interests, certain railways, and the Water Power Trust. I have shown the direct connection of many interests in my remarks in the Record for October 8, but desire to present other irrefutable evidence to show additional influences behind this proposed barrel and to point out a few vicious projects it has contained in the past and is expected to contain before it passes both Houses.

Army engineers have been quoted to us repeatedly in support of vicious, worthless projects. They are required to approve every project in order to prevent the cupidity of Congressmen from walking off with too large loot barrels. We have been repeatedly informed that Army engineers are the watchdogs of the Treasury, and their sensibilities have been injured, according to common report, because of criticism leveled against the "barrel." I believe the engineers, as a class, are honorable and able men, and do not wish to do any of them injustice; but am convinced, I am about to discuss one of the worst cases of Government loot ever attempted under the guise of "navigation"—with the engineers' indorsement.

*ENGINEERS URGE A PARTICULARLY BAD PROJECT.*

If this project is once begun it will open the door immediately to Government expenditures running into hundreds of millions of dollars to be expended for private special interests. Never before has the disguise been completely thrown off nor have Army engineers surrendered unconditionally to powerful political interests, so far as my knowledge goes. Heretofore they have made a pretense of opposing "humbugs and steals," but they now recommend immediate allowance of a gigantic fraud—war taxes or no war taxes. This is vigorous language, but I hope it may arouse Members to the true character of vicious waterway legislation which the people are called upon to pay for by a direct war tax.

The careful attention of every Member is invited to Document No. 20 of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Sixty-third Congress, relating to the Tennessee River between Browns Island and the railroad bridge below the city of Florence, Ala.—Muscle Shoals. The document contains 84 pages and several maps that should be carefully examined by those who are being urged to vote for waterway projects on the ground that they have received the approval of Army engineers.

Mr. NELSON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. What river is this?

Mr. FREAR. The Tennessee River, in the State of Alabama.

*WHAT IS BEHIND AN EIGHTEEN MILLION FRAUD?*

The 1914 bill contained a preliminary \$150,000 appropriation for this item. On Saturday, December 12, another hearing before the House committee was held on this same project, and I quote a paragraph from the press account of that hearing:

Members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee queried the witnesses as to whether they believed the railroads were back of the movement to oppose the development of navigation at Muscle Shoals. The witnesses said they felt that the railroads were strongly opposed to such development.

What was the purpose of asking such foolish questions concerning a proposed filching from the Treasury of \$18,701,000 with which to finance a water-power company? Did any member of the committee demand the names of the powerful inter-

ests that are forcing this high-handed proposal through Congress?

AN \$18,000,000 PRESENT TO THE TRUST.

Heretofore projects, however wasteful or ridiculous in character they may appear to be, have offered some pretense of being intended for navigation. Muscle Shoals, new project recommended by the Army engineers, to be begun by January 1, 1915, and to be completed by 1920, calls for \$18,701,000 to finance a water-power proposition for the Alabama Power Co. that already controls all the power along the Tennessee and Coosa Rivers.

Pursuant to the proposal of Army engineers, this \$18,701,000 is to be expended at once, and the money is to be spent in building dams, locks, and power plant for the Muscle Shoals Hydroelectric Power Co., a branch of the Alabama Power Trust. This Government, with the approval and recommendation of its own Army engineers, according to their report, is about to help build a water-power plant for the Alabama Power Co. at a cost of \$18,701,000, and to give a lease for 100 years to this Water Power Trust. Holding the bag, financially speaking, the Government tries to get back \$8,376,000 of the amount, during the course of a hundred years. The remaining \$10,325,000, however, is to be given over as a Christmas present.

To be fair in the statements of facts, I will say that \$8,575,000 is ostensibly for navigation, but through a pretense is as hypocritical in character as the offer for public bids between a straw man and a Water Power Trust.

As Document No. 20, throughout its whole astonishing text of 84 pages, does not give a solitary fact from which to determine why \$8,575,000 is to be spent for navigation, I have undertaken some investigation of the subject.

Army engineers, who were educated by the Government and have ever since been its confidential paid advisers, have determined that of the \$18,701,000 to be expended for water power mathematical exactness requires that a contract with the Water Power Trust should be so apportioned that our Government will pay \$8,575,000 of the amount and charge it up to a profit and loss account of "navigation," and \$1,750,000 additional for "easements."

#### PARCICAL RIVER TRAFFIC.

In a published statement Senator BURTON mercilessly dissects scores of projects contained in the 1914 "pork barrel." Turning his attention to Muscle Shoals, Senator BURTON's article says:

For the Muscle Shoals improvements on the Tennessee River, about 150 miles below the Chattanooga, the appropriations to-day have been \$3,191,726. Commerce through this canal in 1912 was 5,520 tons of all types. Each year shows a decrease in traffic. The commerce through this canal in 1906 amounted to 26,878 tons, in 1909 it was 17,353 tons, and in 1911 it was 8,962 tons. For the last fiscal year it cost \$48,292 to operate and maintain this canal. Interest on the investment at 3 per cent was \$95,751.78. Including interest and cost of maintenance the Government last year spent \$26.09 for every ton of freight of all classes going through the Muscle Shoals Canal.

Mr. NELSON. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. What is the cause of the decline after the expenditure of these funds?

Mr. FREAR. Competition due to railroads that have gone into that country very largely, according to the reports.

Mr. NELSON. Will the gentleman permit another question?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. Do they expect in some way to reverse that competition? How do they expect to get it back?

Mr. FREAR. If the gentleman will listen to me for a moment, I will give him a statement of the condition of affairs that is in reply to that very question. It is interesting, if not instructive.

The Army engineers have recommended an expenditure of \$3,191,726 to secure 5,520 tons of freight. But it does not tell the whole story. On page 2510 of the Engineer's Report for 1913 appears the character of the 5,520 tons, which cost the Government over \$140,000 for 1912. Therein it appears 2,473 tons were fertilizer, floatable logs, or timber, leaving a balance of 3,047 tons of miscellaneous freight, including coal, grain, and hay.

A GOVERNMENT EXPENSE OF \$26 PER TON FOR FERTILIZER.

These figures are taken from the Army Engineers' Report, which report the same Army engineers prepared prior to making their recommendations contained in Document No. 20. Yet with facts staring them in the face from their own reports, proving that after an expenditure of \$3,191,726 commerce of Muscle Shoals diminished from 26,878 tons in 1906 to 5,520 tons in 1912, with further facts disclosed by their own reports showing that practically half of this insignificant traffic is composed of fertilizer or floatable material and the balance of mis-

cellaneous freight, with all this array of facts to condemn incompetence responsible for a waste of \$3,191,726 and an annual Government cost of \$26 a ton for putting fertilizer through the Muscle Shoals locks—I say, with all this record of its own poor judgment spread before its gaze from its own official records, the Army board now recommends an immediate expenditure by the Government of \$8,575,000 more for the accommodation of this 5,520 tons of fertilizer and other cheap freight.

#### SCANDALOUS WATER-POWER PROJECTS.

More scandalous, it recommends immediate enactment into law of an additional advancement of over \$10,000,000 more with which the Government is directed to build a water-power plant for the Water Power Trust, extending a trust franchise for 100 years and giving exclusive grasp to a monopoly that already controls all other water powers in Alabama.

Have I made this much plain? If so, it is not the whole case, because the report demonstrates this Government has been persuaded by its engineers to dump millions into the Coosa River, ostensibly for navigation, but for the Alabama Power Co. monopoly as is shown by pages 82, 83, and 84 of the report contained in Document No. 20.

Mr. MOON. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly.

Mr. MOON. I would like for the gentleman to state his figures as to the traffic in tons on the Tennessee River.

Mr. FREAR. At Muscle Shoals it is 5,520 tons.

Mr. MOON. What was the tonnage of the entire river last year; does the gentleman know?

Mr. FREAR. That is all that is given by the engineers for that place.

Mr. MOON. I want to inform the gentleman the tonnage was about 1,300,000 tons, to the value of about \$13,000,000.

Mr. FREAR. In reply to that let me say to the gentleman I have given a great deal of attention to the method of preparation of engineers' statistics. I can convince him or any other man, I believe, in a short time that but very little reliance is sometimes to be placed upon the estimate received from them and from their own admission at times.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him this: If there is no reliance to be placed upon the reports of engineers gathered over the United States along the rivers as to the traffic, where can we look and to whom for such facts?

Mr. FREAR. I wish the gentleman would listen to me for a few moments, and I will endeavor to enlighten him as to my own views of that and say that they have arrived at this exact measurement because the freight was carried through the lock and an exact determination made. I am not criticizing their efforts, but traffic statistics should be carefully examined from their own admissions.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman does not include, then, any tonnage that passes along other parts of the river that does not go through Muscle Shoals?

Mr. FREAR. I will say this, the Army engineers show that 5,500 tons have gone through this lock. That is all they show at this point.

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman know a commission on waterways of the United States, composed of six Senators and six Representatives, have reported that the Tennessee River had maintained its tonnage as the fourth river in the United States?

Mr. FREAR. I am glad the gentleman said that, because if he had been listening to me he would have learned that inside the period of six years, according to the Army engineers themselves, the traffic on that river has decreased from 26,000 tons to 5,500 tons. Beyond that, the chairman of that great waterways committee, the best acknowledged expert in the United States, is the gentleman from whom I have been quoting.

Mr. MOON. The report was signed by that gentleman and shows for itself. As a matter of fact, it does not show any such figures, because in a hearing before the Rivers and Harbors Committee only a few days ago they are shown to be thoroughly erroneous.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

My BRYAN. The gentleman spoke a while ago about the Alabama water-power trust.

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. Has the gentleman investigated, and is it not a fact that the Alabama corporation is principally foreign owned?

Mr. FREAR. It is part of the General Electric. It is in the general trust.

Mr. BRYAN. And owned by Canadian owners, very largely, is it not?



Mr. FREAR. I am not sure, but it is part of the General Electric Trust.

A GOVERNMENT EXPENSE OF \$100 PER TON FOR FERTILIZER—SAME STREAM.

We learn that after an investment of \$3,191,726 only 5,520 tons of fertilizer is shipped annually at a cost to the Government of \$26 per ton. It is equally illuminating to learn that after spending \$8,575,000 more on Muscle Shoals, or \$11,766,726 in all "for navigation," the average cost to the Government for conveying this fertilizer through Muscle Shoals will be approximately \$100 per ton, based on a 5 per cent charge for interest, maintenance, and depreciation.

By a singular coincidence this water traffic rate is estimated to be the approximate cost to the Government per ton on the Missouri when present expenditures of \$27,000,000 shall have been completed.

By a further coincidence decrease in traffic quoted on the Muscle Shoals, Missouri, and lower Mississippi Rivers, after all this prodigious shower of gold into these trafficless streams, has been an approximate 80 per cent loss in every case, according to the engineers' reports.

So much for Army engineers who control Government purse strings for statesmen who are expected to approve indefensible recommendations.

Is this statement a slander on the judgment or reliability of Army engineers? We have been given repeated shocks when discussing the 25 projects for North Carolina; streams dry eight months in the year in Florida; of artesian well proposals for the \$10,000,000 Trinity River; of the \$20,000,000 future expenditures for a bankrupt 13-mile canal. All of these schemes have weakened public confidence in recommendations of Army engineers. Let us study the Muscle Shoals \$18,701,000 project.

CHIEF KINGMAN SAYS IT IS A GOOD THING.

Quoting briefly from the report on Muscle Shoals, signed by Dan C. Kingman, Chief of Engineers, Document No. 20, pages 1 and 2, we find:

The cost of providing 6-foot navigation under a plan contemplating a water-power development satisfactory to this company is estimated by the special board at \$18,701,000. Of this approximately \$8,575,000 may properly represent the value of the proposed improvement to navigation, the remainder being chargeable to power development and to be reimbursed to the United States with interest under a definite schedule of payments, the first to be a cash payment of \$3,000,000 upon the completion of the structures at site No. 2, to be followed by 99 annual cash payments in amounts which, with the first payment, will return the entire part of the cost chargeable to power development with compound interest at 3 per cent. In addition the company proposes to pay each year an amount equivalent to 35 cents per horsepower of installed capacity, beginning as soon as this exceeds 200,000 horsepower, and in any case not later than 20 years after first power is developed. The lease period proposed is 100 years.

THE \$18,701,000 GIFT SHOULD NOT BE DELAYED.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has carefully considered this plan and is in general accord with the views and recommendations of the special board, though believing that a due regard of public interests requires that some equitable provision should be made whereby the United States may terminate the lease at any time after the end of 50 years in case it should become apparent that such action is desirable. With this provision the board is of opinion that it is advisable for the United States to adopt the project outlined by the special board for combined navigation improvement and power development on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Ala., in cooperation with the Muscle Shoals Hydroelectric Power Co., at a total estimated cost of \$18,701,000 under the conditions specified by the special board. The first appropriation should provide at least \$1,000,000 in cash and contract authorization for the balance, with a view to completion of the work in five years. In case Congress does not adopt the project at once the board recommends an appropriation of \$150,000 to provide for completion of the detailed surveys, foundation borings, and preparation of plans, so that there need be no unnecessary delay in active prosecution of the work whenever it is authorized.

THE FIRST VERY LARGE PRIVATE JOB RECOMMENDED.

After due consideration of the above-mentioned reports I concur with the views of the special board and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. Attention is particularly invited to the general comments made by the latter board in the final paragraph of its report relative to the economic questions involved in the financing of joint navigation and water-power developments, of which the one herein proposed is the first to be recommended on a very large scale.

DAN C. KINGMAN,

Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

Hon. S. M. SPARKMAN,  
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,  
House of Representatives.

Possibly it may be said the Chief Engineer does not reflect the views of the Army board, to which fulsome praise has been awarded by those who have projects awaiting favorable action by this supreme court of Army engineers. That the court appears to be of one mind is apparent from Document 20, which is signed by several distinguished officials.

FINANCING A MONOPOLY.

On page 5, paragraph 12, the board justifies its efforts to create a water-power monopoly at the expense of Uncle Sam,

instead of permitting independent plants to supply legitimate demands, as follows:

The Muscle Shoals Hydroelectric Power Co. has interests in other power developments on the Tallapoosa, the Coosa, and the Little River. Connecting these developments with the proposed Muscle Shoals development will make up deficiency in power at the latter place during seasons of low water. This fact alone enables the power company to plan for an ultimate installation at Muscle Shoals of 680,000 horsepower measured at the switchboard. The special board states that such a combination of power plants, if suitably regulated by State or Nation, will be of far greater public benefit than a number of independent power plants with incomplete development of each plant.

The cat is out of the bag, and the straw-man bidder exists gracefully.

On page 6, paragraph 18, occurs an X-ray view into the peculiar understanding of official responsibility possessed by this board and the complete dominance of judgment by interests antagonistic to the public welfare and helpless millions who are paying a war tax to cover past extravagance. I quote:

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has carefully considered this plan and is in general accord with the views and recommendations of the special board. The project contemplates primarily the conservation of one of the great natural resources of the Nation by the development of power in large amount and incidentally the improvement for navigation throughout the year of a reach of about 82 miles of the Tennessee River. An expenditure by the United States of \$18,701,000 within a period of five years is contemplated. Of this total, \$8,575,000 is estimated as the cost of the portion of the work which properly may be considered as an improvement of navigation.

To this should be added another gift of \$1,750,000 for power purposes, as I shall later show.

Eight million five hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars is to be added to the \$3,191,000 already spent on this project, which has lost 80 per cent of its traffic within eight years, and amounts to a grand total at this point of 5,520 tons, largely of fertilizer. What is this vast amount of money to be spent for?

Mr. MOON. The gentleman understands we are not agreeing that is true?

Mr. FREAR. Of course the gentleman has the privilege of answering in his own time. Besides that \$8,575,000 spent for navigation, \$1,750,000 is recommended by the Army engineers for water easements for this water-power company, and that is after a minority report of protest was filed by one engineer. I must read it in order to give you the facts to show how even an Army engineer felt it improper to throw away Government money in this way, notwithstanding he consented to the \$8,750,000 for navigation for this insignificant tonnage.

Mr. MOON. May I ask the gentleman how much money it would take to put in repair the United States canal that now runs along Muscle Shoals and through which the tonnage must now go?

Mr. FREAR. I am going to read from the report the conditions given in the documents, and the gentleman will understand that my time is limited, unless I can be yielded more time.

Mr. MOON. I want to suggest to the gentleman the cost of repairs there will amount to nearly as much money as it will take to put locks and dams in that place, and the power company proposes to turn back to the Government any money expended except that expended for navigation purposes.

Mr. FREAR. We will discuss what the power company proposes to do before we get through, because I have the official document in which they make the proposal and the cause of the straw bid at that time.

Here is the minority report of the engineer.

Let me point out explicitly one or more features of this remarkable report, the first of the kind, according to its own statement, ever presented, by calling attention to a dissenting report of Lieut. Col. Riché, who says, on page 57, paragraph 24:

In conclusion, I recommend that all lands and easements needed for this improvement be required to be donated to the United States, and do not fear that such delay as this may cause will result in loss to the United States or will prevent the combined improvement of Muscle Shoals for adequate navigation and maximum power developments, even if the loss of the present offer of the Muscle Shoals Hydro-Electric Power Co. should result. In other respects, except where herein stated to the contrary, I concur in the report signed by the other members of the board.

He refuses to consent to an expenditure of \$1,750,000 for easements for the water-power company, because he can find no justification. That is an Army engineer.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. If the gentleman will give me further time, I will do so.

Mr. MOON. I shall be glad to see you get all the time you want. I ask you if that is the minority and not the majority report?

Mr. FREAR. I will give you the majority report now, reading from page 6. This is a report of the board. Just listen to this, please:

## THE BOARD REPUDIATES AN "INNOVATION."

Riché dissented from buying up lands and easements for the purpose of creating this water power. The whole purpose is disclosed by the Board of Engineers when, on page 6, paragraph 16, the minority report of Lieut. Col. Riché is overruled, as follows:

One member of the special board submitted a minority report, advocating the view that by reason of special benefits enjoyed by local interests they should be required to furnish to the United States free of cost all necessary lands and flowage rights, estimated to cost about \$1,750,000. The majority of the special board, while in general sympathy with the adoption of such a policy on river and harbor work, considered it inadvisable to make the innovation in this case, as it would doubtless lead to considerable delay and would be apt to defeat the present opportunity to make this improvement on favorable terms."

This is signed by the board.

For whom? For the water-power company.

And would be apt to defeat the present opportunity to make this improvement on favorable terms.

To whom? To the water-power company, with only a straw man to bid against it.

Mr. MOON. That is your statement about it.

Mr. FREAR. Can a man come to any different conclusion after reading the engineer's report?

Mr. MOON. You ask a question and answer it, and put it in the mouth of the engineers. They do not make it at all.

Mr. FREAR. I say that this is a most novel report. The engineers themselves say so.

Mr. MOON. You should not put it in the mouths of the engineers to say that it is a scandalous report.

Mr. FREAR. No; I do not wish to be so understood. The gentleman can interrupt. I have admiration for his ability and interest in this project. I realize it comes home. I am not speaking from any personal feeling except I do not like to see \$18,000,000 thrown away by the Government for a water-power company. [Applause.]

## FLOATING SCHEMES, NOT BOATS.

What must be the logical conclusions drawn from such proposals by our guardians of creeks and rivulets and of our collective legislative conscience. The Alabama Power Trust is about to take over Muscle Shoals and the Government is about to spend \$18,701,000 to float the scheme. That is the only thing that can ever be floated at Muscle Shoals, and that is the only kind of commerce involved in the tremendous expenditure proposed by the Army board.

Returning to document 20, we find this recommendation by the Board of Engineers, on page 8, paragraph 24:

The board therefore reports that in its opinion it is advisable for the United States to adopt the project recommended by the special board for combined navigation improvement and power development on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Ala., in cooperation with the Muscle Shoals Hydroelectric Power Co., at total estimated cost of \$18,701,000, under the conditions specified by the special board and with the additional provisions suggested above for possible recall of the franchise after the lapse of 50 years. The first appropriation should provide at least \$1,000,000 in cash and contract authorization for the balance, with a view to completion of the work in five years.

When the 1914 river and harbor bill of \$76,000,000—counting new projects—was presented to the House, the distinguished chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee made use of this remarkable language:

## BILLIONS OF DOLLARS DEMANDED BY WILSON?

But what of the cost? That is another pertinent question.

If we enter upon other works having no direct or necessary relation to navigation there is no telling where we will land. Why, there are propositions advanced, some of them now before Congress, advocated and supported by men of national repute, the adoption and carrying out of which would cost billions of dollars.

We have on the books to-day, including those taken on in this bill, about \$300,000,000 of projects, \$150,000,000, in round figures, or half of it, being for four rivers—the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Missouri, and the East River in New York, the last named, however, only requiring about \$13,000,000 to complete. The work on these four streams, if the plans laid down by the engineers are followed, is to extend over a period ranging from 8 to 25 years; perhaps a little beyond that. The other \$150,000,000 will likely be required during the next 8 years; that is, if the plans of the engineers are carried out. Of course there will be other projects; but we must remember that there are yet other projects still on hand and yet to be considered. There were before our committee about \$50,000,000 of projects submitted within the past two years besides the \$38,000,000 we have adopted in this bill. I do not know that all of those will meet with favorable consideration in the future; the chances are they will not; but if they should all be adopted, the amount, including those adopted or recommended in this bill, will reach \$350,000,000.

In that connection I call special attention to the following sentence I have quoted from Chairman SPARKMAN's speech:

Why, there are propositions advanced, some of them now before Congress, advocated and supported by men of national repute, the adoption and carrying out of which would cost billions of dollars.

What projects did he refer to? Can any project for waterways come before Congress without the approval of Army engineers? The chairman should give to the House all particulars regarding water-power projects which in the aggregate,

presumably, will take billions of dollars to finance. We further ask, Who are the men of national repute standing behind these extravagant projects? Are they standing behind the Muscle Shoals project? If so, who are they?

## BILLIONS OF DOLLARS FOR WATER-POWER INTERESTS.

No intelligent man will question the proposition that if our Government is to finance all the water-power propositions that have been optioned by the General Electric Power Trust, including its subsidiary, the Alabama Power Light & Water Co., and innumerable deputy subsidiaries like the Muscle Shoals Hydroelectric Co., that billions of dollars may be abstracted from the Federal Treasury to finance these projects.

Aside from political pull exercised by men behind the Muscle Shoals proposition, as suggested by the remark of the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, why should not the Government, with equal propriety, finance every water-power project from New England to the Pacific coast?

And why not extend the field of Government gifts to all corporate bodies, great and small, that have some place in our industrial system?

Let the people who pay the income tax and the war tax and other taxes, directly or indirectly, understand that this is proposed to be a Government to support privilege and they will then awaken to the danger of this pretended waterway improvement recommended by Army engineers.

It hardly seems necessary to quote further from this illuminating 84-page water-project report, and in ascertaining responsibility I do not overlook letters of instruction from the Rivers and Harbors Committee dated June 14, 1910, and February 24, 1914, respectively. The character of the Engineers' report and its effort to give to a water-power trust \$8,575,000 for fake navigation can not be explained by any action of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, however objectionable such action of that committee may appear to many Members.

Mr. COX. How much is that dam going to cost?

Mr. FREAR. Eighteen million seven hundred and one thousand dollars is the project. I have forgotten how many there were.

Mr. MOON. There are two of them. The gentleman does not recollect about it.

Mr. FREAR. Only \$18,701,000 for two dams. Read the document. I do not ask you to take my interpretation as to what it contains.

## HIGH FINANCING BY THE GOVERNMENT.

In order that Congress may have some further light on the way it has been hoodwinked into throwing away money on Alabama water-power projects I quote extracts from pages 82, 83, and 84 of this same document 20:

While it can not be said at this time whether the operation of the proposed plants on the Coosa River will or will not increase the amount of power which can be commercially generated at Muscle Shoals, these plants will be considered here in a general way to show the ultimate relation between the Coosa system and the Muscle Shoals-Tallapoosa system.

The following plants are proposed on the Coosa: Lock 12 (now under construction), Lock 7, Lock 14, Lock 15, and Lock 18. In the place of Lock 14 and Lock 15 we proposed to raise the Lock 18 dam to a height which will back the water up to Duncans Riffle and to build a dam at Duncans Riffle which will back the water up to Lock 12. The total amount of fall between the pool level of Lock 12 and the tail-water of Lock 18 is 230 feet; the distance between them is 32.8 miles. Diagrams Nos. A-3457, A-3458, and A-3459 show the amount of power available at these sites. The pools above these dams are of no great extent, being 5,200, 3,500, and 3,600 acres in extent above Lock 12, Duncans Riffle, and Lock 18, respectively. These pools are of sufficient area for storage of water during fluctuations covering several days, but will be of little benefit in storing water for extended periods.

The Lock 18 site has been studied in detail and subsurface conditions have been investigated by diamond drilling. It is an admirable site, foundations are good, quantities of masonry required being comparatively low, and construction materials being near at hand.

No study has been made of the Lock 7 site.

Here is where the engineers do a stroke for navigation when they demand a 150-foot dam at Cartersville. Think of this proposal for Etowah Creek when they say:

## 150-FOOT HIGH FINANCING.

The Army engineers propose to build a dam and reservoir on the Etowah River at Cartersville, Ga., which will add an immense amount to the primary power of the plants on the Coosa. The project will consist of a dam 150 feet high, impounding 30,000,000,000 cubic feet of water. The object of this reservoir is primarily to increase the flow of water in Alabama River below Montgomery for the aid of navigation, the available draft to be used to amplify the low flow being variously estimated from 4,000 to 5,000 second-feet. The dam site is 3 miles above Cartersville and the entire reservoir is in Georgia. Surveys of reservoir have been made by the Army engineers, and their findings are in a report on the Coosa River prepared by Maj. Ferguson, which has not been published. The dam site is now owned by the Georgia Railway, Light & Power Co., who own an amount of land within the reservoir.

## A MYSTERY EXPLAINED.

I quote from my remarks on the Coosa River proposition, appearing on page 7073 of the RECORD, made at the time the last rivers and harbors bill was before this House. Some



of the mystery surrounding that project which was incomprehensible six months ago is as clear as the noonday sun when the X-ray of Document 20 is placed in proper position.

#### CANALIZATION NIGHTMARES.

Another mythical scheme is the Coosa River, Ga., which only gets \$65,000, page 23 of the bill. Nothing startling appears in this item until we read the engineer's report and learn that a project for the canalization of this river started in 1890, 24 years ago, was modified in 1892, and provides for 23 locks and dams of the Coosa River, Ga., at an estimated cost of \$5,108,422. By June 30, 1909, the intelligent engineers' office had expended \$401,372 and had only 4 per cent of the project completed. This was doing fairly well for the engineers' office, which had been so many years on the job. Like a thrifty storekeeper, the engineer took an accounting of 19 years' progress, and in 1909 the waiting public was informed by his report:

"On account of the numerous rapids, this part of the river has never been navigable. As yet (after 19 years) no benefit has been derived from this improvement, and its value is entirely dependent on the completion of the entire system."

Amount required for the completion of the existing project is \$6,059,913. This statement, issued 19 years after the project had been started, shows an expenditure of \$401,372 and a jump in estimates of \$953,481. And after 19 years the stream was as worthless as ever. Taking up the intelligent Engineers' Report for 1913 I find, on page 2134, that—

"a small commerce in the rafting of logs and square timber can only be carried on when the river is about 12 feet above low water, and no reliable estimate of its value can be ascertained."

And this is the progress made in 24 years with a worthless project. Congress appropriates \$65,000 in 1914, although the engineer says, page 2133:

"No appropriation is recommended for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915."

At the rate of progress made on the Coosa River we may reasonably expect navigation will be opened up by the year 2014, provided the engineers do not disgust Congress with this stupid, reckless, senseless, wasteful proposition. It will take a century to complete, and it will be as valuable as a toy balloon when the \$6,000,000—or, possibly, \$10,000,000—has been sunk in the Coosa River. In addressing ourselves to the indictment of criminal incompetence in the handling of this project we may well ask, Who is to blame?

At that time it was strenuously contended this enormous expenditure was for future navigation. The hypocritical mask has been torn off by Document 20, from which I have quoted. Private water powers and not public navigation appear to be involved in this project.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is it not a fact that many of these engineers that have this infallible judgment have time and time again turned them down and then finally recommended them?

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman has just struck what I am going into.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Has the gentleman ever looked into why these Army engineers change their mind as to the commercial importance of navigability of these rivers after years of opposition to them?

Mr. FREAR. I have prepared an answer for the gentleman. He understands the value, the persuasive value, as it commercially bears on the Trinity River, better than anybody else who spoke on the bill at the last session, and his judgment agrees with mine on the general proposition.

#### ELEVEN HEAVY GUNS TURN THE ENGINEERS' FLANK.

A bare statement of the Muscle Shoals and other water-power cases may not do exact justice to Army engineers. I have been much impressed with their efforts to do right, and the apparent reason sometimes offered for their surrender to constant pounding by powerful interests.

Take, for instance, the Cumberland River project above Nashville, found in Document No. 10, River and Harbor Committee, Sixty-third Congress, second session. The report covers 140 pages and is worthy of careful study.

In 1882 an experimental canalization scheme to cost \$8,500,000 was authorized. It provides for 28 locks and dams, but after building a few locks and spending about \$3,000,000, without aid to traffic, the rest of the project was abandoned on the report of the Army Board of Engineers in 1906. Persistent hammering brought a second adverse report from Maj. Harts in 1910, and a third refusal, in response to local demands, was filed by Maj. Burgess on October 29, 1912. All of these reports disapproved of further expenditures on a bad investment.

Then came to notice a "booster" club of Nashville, which proceeded to furnish rainbow statistics of possibilities, as glittering in character as the inconsiderable and rapidly decreasing river traffic would permit the booster conscience to present. Thereupon Maj. Burgess cogitated, modified his report, but while falling in this one-sided battle, the major declared that \$4,500,000 must not be expended by the Government unless local communities contributed one-half of that amount. In view of the small and decreasing river traffic shown by the report, after deducting floatable timber, this report is significant of a sudden and inexplicable change of heart. By a surprising coincidence the division engineer adopted the new Burgess report of 1913, conditional upon the localities contributing one-half of the \$4,500,000.

#### THE MILITARY ADVANTAGE OF MASSED FORMATIONS.

After following this interesting reversal of action through the report, it becomes doubly instructive to watch a siege campaign prosecuted against the Army engineers. Two United States Senators and nine Congressmen, with some lesser lights, confronted the Army board on both flank and center, from pages 5 to 38, in an assault to determine why this project, so frequently disapproved, should not be given an official O. K. and \$4,500,000 surrendered unconditionally.

The struggle of Col. Black to save his hospital corps before surrendering is related on page 9, when he faces heavy artillery with the remark, "This money belongs to all the people of the United States, and it is perfectly well known that there are many more improvements urgently asked for than there is money to pay for." To clinch his argument he declares:

Now, on the basis of the return by the distribution of fair costs to the whole people of the United States there does not seem to be a return commensurate with an investment of \$4,500,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Let me suggest before I answer the gentleman from Tennessee that my proposal is not original with me. It is the proposal of many who see the wickedness of the present system—that a high-grade commission should pass upon this question. We all believe in waterway improvement, and we all believe in improvements for proper navigation. We want to see it done properly. But under the present condition of affairs it is wasteful, as I have shown in other cases, where after an expenditure of \$3,000,000 it costs \$26 a ton to ship 5,000 tons through the locks, and now they are asking \$8,575,000 more for those two locks. Now I will yield.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman stated a moment ago that the change in the report of the engineers in regard to the upper Cumberland was due to the activities of a certain booster club of Nashville. I want to ask the gentleman what authority he has for that statement?

Mr. FREAR. The report of the engineer himself. He says he first formed his judgment—that is, Maj. Burgess—upon the character of the traffic upon that stream, but that he had received the report of the "Nashville Booster Club"—and he gives the title of the club—and they furnished additional data in regard to the traffic. Based upon that, I understand, he changes his report, but with this modification, that he asks that the local community shall contribute at least one-half. That was the form of the question when the 11 Members of Congress went before the Army engineers to have removed that provision for \$2,250,000 conditional local aid.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say to the gentleman, with all respect, that I hope the other statements he has made in the course of his address have been founded more upon fact than his statement that the change of the district engineer with reference to the upper Cumberland was due to the activities of any booster club, or any club, of the city of Nashville. If the gentleman will pardon me for just a moment, I happen to know personally—

Mr. FREAR. I hope the gentleman, if he is going to make a statement, will make it in his own time and not in mine.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the gentleman has done the engineers a very gross and grave injustice, and I am sure the gentleman does not want to do that. Mr. Myers, accompanied by the gentleman from Tennessee, Judge HULL, and myself appeared before the board here in Washington, and succeeded in convincing them that a grave injustice had been done to the upper Cumberland River in the report as to the amount of commerce that was carried on from year to year upon that river. Thereupon the matter was referred to the district engineer. He made a careful investigation and later made a report.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield further.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. FREAR. I feel that I can not yield any further. I have not the time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin two minutes?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Surely.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman made a remark a few minutes ago to the effect that the district engineer had reported a proposition that the States of Tennessee and Kentucky should contribute one-half to the improvement of the upper river. I want to ask the gentleman if in all the history of former projects any project was ever put through Congress where any States were required to pay half of the cost of the improvements?

Mr. FREAR. I do not know what the experience has been except in the last bill. In the case of Taniger Island and other communities that could not do the work themselves, that was done.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My question was whether or not, with respect to any other river, other States had ever been required to contribute any portion of the expense of improving rivers within their borders?

Mr. FREAR. I can not enumerate them.

Mr. STAFFORD. If my colleague will yield, I could enlighten my good friend from Tennessee. The State of Pennsylvania, for example, was obliged to contribute to the improvement of the Delaware River. The city of Milwaukee was required to contribute to the improvement of the inner harbor.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In what amount?

Mr. STAFFORD. Something like half a million dollars.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman know that the \$500,000 contributed by the city of Milwaukee to the improvement was anything like one-half of the whole amount required?

Mr. STAFFORD. I know that formerly it was frequently the case with regard to rivers and harbors, but that policy has apparently been abandoned by the present leaders.

Mr. BRYAN. The State of Washington, I may say, contributed a very large sum in the improvement of the Washington Canal.

Mr. FREAR. The people of Massachusetts have appropriated more than \$9,000,000 for the improvement of Boston Harbor.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That may be true with regard to a river or harbor located in one State, but not in the case of a river flowing through two or more States.

Mr. FREAR. I would be glad to have members of the committee spend the time to take up this report, No. 10, of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the Sixty-third Congress, and read on page 55 the report of the Nashville Booster Club, and notice the exhibits they filed and presented to the engineer before he changed his opinion. I am not criticizing him. I do not see how he could have done differently. Think of it. Nine Congressmen and two Senators. And I may say among them are some of the ablest men in this House and some of the ablest men on the other side.

Both the district and division engineers had so declared after a thorough investigation.

That is what Col. Black said on January 28, 1914, before 11 able lawyers, incidentally all United States Senators and Congressmen, who made their convincing argument for \$4,500,000.

On February 4, just one week later, the board and Chief of Engineers saw light, pulled down the flag, and all contributions were waived. I do not venture to criticize the right of any delegation or of any number of delegations to boost any project, irrespective of past deliberate and repeated rejections by the engineers. But in exposition of a bad system, let me ask, when 11 able lawyers and concededly influential statesmen appear before the Army board in favor of a local project, bearing the record found in this case, can any reasonable man doubt the necessity of having the Government represented at such hearings or that a high-class independent board should be substituted for the supreme court of Army engineers?

I speak of this case because it is one of many that illustrates a demonstrated weakness of the present system.

Army engineers, however high minded they may be, are subordinates and human, and they have no more chance before an onslaught from 11 heavy howitzer political guns than the proverbial bovine has in fly time.

What a formidable battery for any force of green recruits to face in either House after the project has passed engineers, and what a big stake to fight for, \$4,500,000. It is beyond belief that such a miserable makeshift system as we now practice is either legislatively or economically safe for any nation.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; certainly.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Do you understand how nine Congressmen and two Senators could furnish an engineer with the technical information that would give him light on a great proposition like that?

Mr. FREAR. Unquestionably, yes. It is technical information of the same character that was suggested by the gentleman who preceded me [Mr. GILLET], who was explaining how a person makes a choice from three names that are placed before him on a civil-service certification, and possibly for the same reason.

Mr. CALLAWAY. If he was really making an investigation, and basing his report, as an engineer should, on the commercial importance and navigability of the stream, the information that 9 Congressmen or 90 Congressmen could give him would not be worth anything.

Mr. FREAR. That is a question which the gentleman can answer as well as I can.

A MEMBER. Might they not give some political information?

Mr. FREAR. I assume that such an able body of men—11 of them—and others there present gave all the information they could; and if you will examine the document you will see that practically all of them took part in the discussion, and an able discussion it was.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Has not the gentleman already stated that they went up there on the one proposition—whether the States of Tennessee and Kentucky should contribute?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; that is my understanding of the record.

#### EIGHTY MILLIONS LARGELY WASTED.

One of the most convincing testimonials to political power relating to waterways is afforded by the Mississippi River land reclamation project.

Over \$80,000,000 has been appropriated to date for the lower reach of the Mississippi River below the mouth of the Ohio River. This is a pet project with the organizers of the \$50,000,000 lobby, as a brief investigation will show. The traffic on the lower Mississippi River has decreased over 80 per cent in recent years, notwithstanding a steady stream of golden oxygen which we have patiently poured into this waterway cadaver in an endeavor to resuscitate a lost river commerce.

#### DENUNCIATION FROM THOSE WHO KNOW.

The RECORD of April 10 contains Government statistics on which this traffic loss is based. In the RECORD of October 8 will be found statements of engineers and other corroboration of wasteful expenditures now being made on the Mississippi. The New Orleans Item of September 28, 1914, says definitely:

We told you a year ago that the feeling of the Nation against the abuses of the "pork barrel" was approaching a climax. We warned you that the country would not allow many more pork barrels to be opened.

Of equal significance is its editorial declaration that—

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress conducts a national lobby for the "pork-barrel" bill.

Also this piece of interesting information:

The Mississippi River Levee Association was organized by some railway interests who do not want genuine and permanent stream control, because it threatens competition; by levee board politicians and levee contractors whose jobs and profits depend upon the perpetuation of the stupid and vicious old system.

The river lobby is known from New Orleans to Washington.

In a clean-cut editorial from the Memphis Scimitar this statement occurs:

The old brutal logic that we must "get some of that Yankee money down here" is no longer appealing. The Mississippi River Commission has been discredited by the people. We must have a new deal and a square deal.

That message comes to Congress from Memphis, and the old plea that they are to get some of that "Yankee money" no longer appeals. It is needless to say such conscientious scruples have no part in the sessions of the rivers and harbors lobby.

#### "TRAITORS TO THE REPUBLIC."

An extract from the Memphis Press of September 12, 1914, is as hot and sizzling as anything handed out by the rivers and harbors lobby. In part the editorial says:

We have told our readers on many occasions that the conscience of the Nation was revolting against the "pork barrel." The method of the rivers and harbors bill is indefensible, and the results of that method, pursued through generations, are its own damnation. The would-be perpetrators of the "pork barrel" are the enemies of a comprehensive program, the enemies of real safety, the enemies of revised navigation. It is not going too far to say they are, in effect, "traitors to the Republic."

The foregoing sentiment of able editorial writers of the lower Mississippi Valley, who have seen \$80,000,000 of "Yankee money" wasted on the lower Mississippi, is respectfully referred to those distinguished Members of Congress who fail to find any "pork" in the rivers and harbors bill and to the river and harbor \$50,000,000 lobby, "the enemy of a comprehensive program."

For detailed appropriations for the Mississippi prior to 1914 I cite page 3391 of the Engineers' Report for 1913, wherein the amount at that time appropriated for the lower Mississippi had reached \$77,265,851.

#### PRESENT RIVER TRAFFIC UNIMPORTANT.

Navigation on the Mississippi River is almost a joke, notwithstanding the Government has spent \$80,000,000 on the lower



stretch of the river alone. This is evidenced by official reports. In an extract from a resolution passed by the New Orleans delegates to the international conference at Memphis on November 18, 1914, less than a month ago, it is stated:

New Orleans has no rail and water rates available between New Orleans and a single available point of consumption or production, and no water rates, and thus no cooperation of railroads and river and literally no use of the rivers.

After an expenditure of \$80,000,000 on the lower Mississippi, is it not a matter of widespread concern to learn that at the only large port on the lower river "literally no use of the river" is to be had?

The following editorial extract from a Memphis paper might naturally be attributed to the Trinity of Texas, the Kissimmee of Florida, or Northeast Creek of North Carolina, where similar conditions exist:

The News-Scimitar printed a story the other day about steamboats that walk. They will soon have to learn to fly to enable them to get over the Memphis Harbor.

That does not seem to afford large dividends for an \$80,000,000 outlay. A letter from a man who has studied the Mississippi problem for many years has this to say of the present plan:

MEMPHIS, TENN., October 9, 1914.

Formerly, up to the years 1875 to 1880, there was deep water and no trouble in the whole of our harbor on the river front of Memphis. Now, since the War Department and the United States River Commission has "monkeyed" with our river here, large "cavings off" of the high red clay bluffs on the eastern side of the river, right on the valuable city front, have occurred. Our Riverside Park, losing 62 acres valued at \$4,000 per acre, equals \$248,000. In addition, now, a large sand-bar island, a very short distance off of the small remainder of our wharf, is about to "choke out" steamer navigation altogether.

L. S. LAKE.

Of equal significance is the following statement of the Commissioner of Corporations as to shipments down the river from St. Louis when he says:

Shipments (in 1906) to the lower Mississippi have fallen to less than 7 per cent of the shipments in 1890.

I can not do better than offer a brief statement from a comprehensive article written by Senator BURTON concerning the 200-mile section of the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Missouri and the mouth of the Ohio, wherein he says of this 200-mile stretch:

We have expended approximately \$16,894,000. \* \* \* After \$12,000,000 had been expended some eight years ago another board made an official estimate and declared it would cost \$20,000,000, or \$4,000,000 more than was originally estimated. Now, after \$16,894,000 have been spent there, it is estimated that \$17,250,000 more will be required to complete the work.

The Government has spent \$84,470 per mile on this stretch, and the engineers ask under present estimates \$170,970 per mile. Continuing, he says:

In 1887, before expensive improvements were installed, the traffic on this stretch of the river, as measured by shipments entering and leaving St. Louis, was 1,537,562 tons. In 1912 it was 265,720 tons, or one-sixth of the amount in 1887. \* \* \* In 1871, 44 per cent of the freight shipped out of St. Louis went by river. In 1909 that proportion had dropped from 44 to one-half of 1 per cent.

We have expended more money on this stretch of the Mississippi River than the Prussian Government has spent on the whole Rhine, where they carry an average of 45,000,000 tons a year, one hundred and eighty times the traffic of the Mississippi.

Where is the Representative who, outside of a river and harbor lobby, will defend such inexcusable waste of public funds?

Can any criticism of traffic conditions on the lower Mississippi compare with the bare statement of facts?

#### APPROPRIATIONS JUMP 80 PER CENT IN TWO YEARS.

To show the Mississippi's growth in appropriations I call attention to the fact that the annual lower Mississippi appropriations reached \$4,500,000 in 1912. In 1913 the land reclamation lobby's pressure was too great to resist and the appropriation was jumped to \$6,000,000. On page 1433 of the Engineers' Report for 1913 it appears that the Mississippi River Commission, so roundly denounced by the southern press, went after Government money in real earnest by asking \$7,000,000 in the 1914 bill. Engineers refused to recommend over \$6,000,000, but before the bill was pushed through the House committee by the rivers and harbors lobby the amount had been increased to \$7,000,000 for the lower Mississippi River, and in order to not be outdone in generous giving the Senate committee added another \$1,000,000 just for luck, or \$2,000,000 more than was recommended by the Army engineers. This is all a matter of record—an increase of about 80 per cent in wasteful appropriations in two years for a traffic that has fallen 80 per cent. The total appropriations carried for the Mississippi River in the 1914 bill was \$10,500,000, of which \$9,000,000 was for the Missis-

issippi River below St. Louis. What powerful influences are behind this extravagant project? When questioned on the subject by other Senators the president of the Rivers and Harbors Congress stated in another legislative body on September 14, 1914:

#### RAILROADS DEMANDING APPROPRIATIONS.

I beg to say that the railroads of the Mississippi have aided materially in a propaganda for the protection of the land of that valley from overflow. In the congressional district in Mississippi represented by Mr. HUMPHREYS there are upward of 1,000 miles of railroad belonging to one system—the Illinois Central. It costs money to carry on that kind of a campaign, showing the people of the United States the facts, and the railroads, being as great sufferers as any persons or corporations in the valley, have contributed in proportion to their property interests to carry on that educational propaganda.

How much?

#### RAILROAD CONTRIBUTIONS.

On June 3, on pages 10591 to 10599 of the RECORD, appear my remarks before the House wherein I pointed out secret efforts to influence Congress on rivers and harbors bills from subscriptions of money to the use of threats against business men. At that time I presented the following subscriptions, running for five years, taken from what purported to be a photographic copy of a typewritten statement made by Col. John A. Fox, secretary and manager of the Mississippi Levee Association:

It has been estimated that a minimum fund of \$30,000 per annum is necessary for this organization to do its work in a complete and thorough manner, and already a considerable portion of this sum has been pledged annually for five years (of \$150,000 in all). The subscriptions are as follows:

Southern Railway Co.	\$1,000
Mobile & Ohio R. R.	1,000
Frisco R. R.	1,000
Missouri Pacific R. R.	1,000
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Ry.	1,000
St. Louis Southwestern Ry.	1,000
Illinois Central	1,000
Yazoo & Mississippi Valley R. R.	1,000
Chicago Mill & Lumber Co.	1,000
Caldwell & Smith, Memphis	1,000
International Harvester Co.	1,000

Assurance has been given of other substantial amounts.

As I have before stated, on June 3 I called the attention of the House to contributions made by eight railways for the purpose of aiding in the passage of a river "pork barrel." It will be remembered that contributions approximating \$150,000 for the five-year period were given in the RECORD, and it was further shown that \$40,000 of this amount was guaranteed by eight railroads for the purpose of influencing Congress to pass the bill. At that time I asked why an investigation was not had of this remarkable situation, and I further demanded in my resolution that all interests engaged in lobbying through such bills should be compelled to come out in the open.

#### THE LOBBY'S EDUCATIONAL PROPAGANDA.

The country is informed that the railways of the Mississippi Valley are engaged in an "educational propaganda" in order that their interests may be protected by what the Memphis News-Scimitar frankly says is "Yankee money." But the Scimitar refuses to be a party to the looting proposition, and demands a new and a square deal. If that be brought about, what will be the necessity of longer continuing the Rivers and Harbors Congress which the New Orleans Item declares is a national lobby for the "pork-barrel" bill? Will the owners of 20,000,000 acres of land to be reclaimed by the Mississippi River project submit to this sudden conclusion of the "educational propaganda" now being financed in part by the railway interests along the river? What a theme for discussion is afforded by this one Mississippi River item that, due to political pull, jumped engineers' estimates \$2,000,000 in the 1914 "barrel." Condemned by leading journals in the Mississippi River Valley as a "scheme of railroad interests that do not want genuine and permanent stream control."

What can be said in answer to the Memphis Press, which declares—

the would-be perpetrators of the "pork barrel" are the enemies of the comprehensive program, the enemies of real safety, the enemies of revived navigation—they are, in effect, traitors to the Republic.

These are matters which were not discussed by the lobby that has now adjourned. Do the gentlemen who orated before the rivers and harbors lobby find fault with the judgment of the Memphis Press? To charge a public servant or public official with "treason" is to charge he is an enemy of his country. To betray a public trust is to invite the scorn of right-thinking men.

I do not desire to question the motives of any man nor to impute improper influences, but the country is jealous of its

strong box and more jealous of the honor standards of its trustees. We will not invite public confidence by training with a lobby that declares it demands an annual \$50,000,000 appropriation for a policy not a project. No man is big enough to link himself with such a brazen proposal or with the secret practices of that lobby without suffering some degree of self-reproach for the contact.

#### A THOROUGH INVESTIGATION IS DEMANDED.

What will the Mississippi River get in the new bill for land reclamation? The lobby is particularly interested in this project, and so are the railways which have been generously contributing from railway treasuries to the "educational propaganda" that has for its object an annual grab of millions of Government money. How much is going into the new bill for the Mississippi River land reclamation scheme? More to the point, how much is coming out of the committee for the Mississippi River land reclamation when the "pork barrel" rolls its way through congressional committees and through both Houses, if it does?

The committees increased the 1914 reclamation fund \$2,000,000 over engineers' recommendation during the short period it was in their hands. What will be done with the new bill?

Last session I was charged with failing to object to any large slices of "pork" contained in the barrel. Has my objection to the \$9,000,000 for land reclamation along the Mississippi River been made sufficiently definite? A further discussion of this project occurred in the October 8 Record.

In my humble judgment, not one dollar of Government money should be expended for land-reclamation purposes, either along the Mississippi River or elsewhere, nor should more money be expended on the Mississippi River until we have the opinion of an expert board on charges filed that the present plan is unscientific, wasteful, and of no value.

I have offered a resolution asking that a high-class engineering board investigate and report on the Mississippi River problem and have presented evidence of engineers and influential journals in the valley calling for the appointment of such board. Nearly 100 letters received on this subject from some of the highest authorities in the country approve my proposal. These letters are subject to examination by the committee whenever it considers my resolution. Many plans are proposed. I am not concerned with any of them, whether they refer to the Newlands \$600,000,000 plan, the Riker spillway plan, the present project, or any of the others. Let the President appoint a high-class board to consider the whole question and have the board advise Congress before another dollar is wasted on the present plan. Genuine progress in meeting this river problem can be had by passing a resolution concerning the Mississippi River which is now awaiting action from the Rivers and Harbors Committee:

[H. Con. Res. 50. Sixty-third Congress, second session. In the House of Representatives. September 21, 1914. Mr. FREAR submitted the following concurrent resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.]

Whereas about \$200,000,000 have been expended in attempt to control the Mississippi River below Cairo, principally by the use of levees and revetments, which as a means for that purpose are deemed by many to be impracticable and futile; and

Whereas by the present rivers and harbors bill further great sums of money are proposed to be appropriated to continue this questionable attempt by the same means: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That no appropriation made by the present rivers and harbors bill shall be available for use upon the Mississippi River below Cairo until the feasibility and advisability of plans which depend upon levees and revetments for control of the Mississippi River below Cairo have been approved, or other plans substituted by an advisory board of consulting engineers, in accordance with the provisions of H. R. 18169, now before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Resolved further, That the members of such advisory board of consulting engineers, appointed by the President in conformity with the provisions of said bill, shall require to be confirmed by the Senate.

#### THE MISSOURI RIVER PROJECT.

We may confidently look for \$2,000,000 in the new bill to help contractors on the Missouri River from Kansas City to its mouth, a distance of some 400 miles. This is part of a \$20,000,000 project, although the Missouri River has lost 80 per cent of its traffic within the past two decades. It has been calculated that every ton of actual freight shipped on the Missouri River, after this wasteful appropriation has been completed, will cost the Government over \$100 per ton.

Distinguished men, defenders of uncertain projects, declare trafficless river expenditures are "freight regulators." Few people will be misled by such specious arguments. Railroad rates are controlled by commissions to-day, and no rate heretofore lowered by water competition can be raised without State

or Federal authority. Rivers carrying insignificant traffic are not freight regulators, but commercial jokes.

Facing the fact that 80 per cent of the Missouri River traffic is gone, after an expenditure on the river of over \$7,000,000, we find, after deducting sand, gravel, and revetment material, that the actual commerce on this river between Kansas City and the mouth is trivial. Does it not seem monstrous folly to dump \$2,000,000 annually into this part of the stream? The traffic is now carried by railways on both sides of the river and it will continue to be carried by the railways unless we subsidize and build a line of steamboats to run the river. The facts regarding this river were considered in the discussion of April 10, and Government statistics were presented to show the character of the Missouri River project.

I quote briefly from one of the statements there submitted after the lower Mississippi appropriations have reached approximately \$80,000,000.

#### BILLS THE GOVERNMENT HAS PAID.

No weather barometer more accurately measures the pressure of air than does St. Louis the falling off of navigation in the Mississippi Valley. Assuming that navigation has held its own since 1906, a violent assumption, an interesting story is related by the table quoted, which reads as follows:

#### St. Louis River traffic.

	Missouri.	Upper Mississippi.	Lower Mississippi.	Total river.	Total rail.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
1890.....	31,385	151,507	765,880	1,265,855	15,240,141
1906.....	6,050	67,140	141,575	416,855	44,964,623
Approximate loss for 16 years.	80%	55%	81%	66%	.....

This table shows that after all the tremendous artificial stimulation by Government appropriations, amounting to \$1 for every man, woman, and child in the country, on the average, during that period the Missouri traffic shows 80 per cent loss, the upper Mississippi 55 per cent loss, the lower Mississippi 81 per cent loss, and the total river tonnage a loss of two-thirds within 16 years.

Is Missouri concerned in the annual expenditure of \$2,000,000 of Government money to keep river dredges and river contractors busy? What portion of the \$9,000,000 to be given by the last river bill for land reclamation purposes on the Mississippi River was to go to Missouri land-reclamation interests? Would Missouri appropriate in one year \$1,750,000 for a 200-mile stretch of the Mississippi and \$2,000,000 for a defunct river traffic on the Missouri and one million more for its private land-reclamation interests on the Mississippi River? That is what Missouri gets out of their annual bills. If Missouri is not contributing, why should the Government embark in such wasteful, unbusinesslike proposals?

#### THE OHIO \$64,000,000 CANALIZATION PROJECT.

The Ohio River received \$4,176,000 in the sundry civil bill and asked for \$5,000,000 more in the defeated 1914 river bill, or \$9,176,000 in one year for its \$64,000,000 canalization scheme.

Statistics affecting this project were offered in the RECORD for April 10 and June 8. It is unnecessary to repeat the statements there shown, but from Government reports the Ohio River traffic amounted to 13,163,656 tons in 1905 and in 1912 it fell to 8,618,396, or 34 per cent loss in seven years. The most significant fact shown by its lockages is that only 2 per cent of lockage traffic is of high-class freight, while 90 per cent of the total river traffic goes by the open river, as it has done for the past hundred years, and for the reason given by practical river men, that through traffic will never permit barge tows to use or wait for 60 locks, or 10 per cent of that number. Allowing full railway freight charges for the coal locked through the canal, it indicates an eventual cost to the Government for the remaining 2 per cent freight of from \$34 to \$45 per ton, depending upon the lock where measurements are made. As a business venture, Missouri River commerce at \$100 per ton cost to the Government on an investment of only \$27,227,935 looks like a better proposition than Ohio River freight at \$45 per ton cost to the Government on an investment of \$64,000,000. However, this is a matter for the expert opinion of Army engineers, who have approved both projects, each of which will confront us in the new bill about to be presented by the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

After spending a dozen millions on the Ohio, with more than fifty millions more in prospect, the importance of securing an opinion of a high-class board as to the value of present plans is



emphasized by the following clipping under date of October 7, 1914:

[From the News-Scimitar, of Memphis, Tenn.]

NEWS OF THE RIVERS.

River bulletin.

MEMPHIS, TENN., October 7, 1914.

Observations taken at 7 a. m., local standard time.

Stations.	Feet second.	Height.	Change.	Precipitation.
Pittsburgh.....	22	6.1	.....	0.54
Parkersburg.....	36	.8	10.3	.....
Cincinnati.....	50	11.4	2.4	.....
Louisville.....	28	7.9	.....	.....
Evansville.....	35	2.0	.....	.....
Nashville.....	40	7.1	1.1	.....
Chattanooga.....	33	5.6	2.2	.....
Johnsonville.....	31	.3	1.1	.....
Paducah.....	43	.5	1.1	.....
St. Paul.....	14	3.6	2.1	.24
Davenport.....	15	4.5	1.2	.....
Omaha.....	19	6.1	.....	.62
Kansas City.....	22	6.5	.....	.01
St. Louis.....	30	7.4	1.3	.....
Cairo.....	45	10.5	11.0	.....
Memphis.....	35	7.7	1.5	.....
Helena.....	42	7.6	1.7	.....
Fort Smith.....	22	3.5	2.1	.....
Little Rock.....	23	1.6	1.6	.....
Vicksburg.....	45	10.4	1.5	.....
Shreveport.....	29	2.7	1.1	.....
New Orleans.....	18	5.0	1.1	.....

<sup>1</sup> Fall.

<sup>2</sup> Rise.

Traffic on the lower part of the Ohio River has been entirely suspended, owing to the lowest water ever known. There is not enough water on Sharps Bar, between Paducah and Cairo, to float a skiff, according to reports, and the steamer *Rapids*, running in the Paducah and Cairo trade, has been withdrawn until a rise comes.

REAL WATERWAY TRAFFIC.

The Ohio River still carries on important river traffic, although far less than before the present \$64,000,000 canalization project was first proposed, at a time when the commerce was all carried by the open river. Nine-tenths of it is now carried by the open river, and will be so carried. After many millions of dollars have been expended, we now learn that the Ohio will not float a skiff—not because the channel is absent, but water is non est.

Nature, and not Army engineers, controls the amount of water in the Ohio, for while men may dig ditches and build dams the Creator determines the fall and flow of water.

REAL TRAFFIC.

I have before me several letters on the Ohio project, including one from Madison, Ind., in which the writer says:

There is no business on the Ohio River to justify the building of locks and dams, and new dams will make no change in shipping or passenger travel. Dredge boats would be sufficient to keep the channel of the Ohio River open for all commerce. We have two boats running between Cincinnati and Louisville that belong to the Louisville & Nashville Railroad.

The Muskingum River and the Kanawha and the Kentucky Rivers all have locks from the mouth to the headwaters, but no boats nor business can be found on these rivers. That river and harbor bill is certainly a "pork barrel."

During the debate on the last river bill a distinguished member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER], amid applause from his colleagues on the committee, suggested that I came from a country where waterways are unknown. When the curriculum of Missouri schools which graduated Representatives in Congress is complete it will include a short course in geography, so inquiring Missouri Members may learn that the Father of Waters, which gets \$9,000,000 on its lower stretch and only \$1,500,000 on the equally long and important upper stretch, forms the western boundary of Wisconsin and over 100 miles of my own district, as it does the eastern boundary of Missouri. The upper river has shown less loss in traffic than the lower river, and its commerce is of far more importance than the 13,016 tons of actual traffic carried by the Missouri in 1912. This latter traffic, it has been demonstrated, will probably cost the Government over \$100 per ton when \$20,000,000 more has been poured into the Missouri, in addition to the \$7,227,935 previously spent. But while kicking the Missouri "houn' dawg" around it may properly be stated that Wisconsin has many harbors on Lake Michigan, including one that annually handles 500 tons of actual commerce for every 1 of the 13,000 tons carried on the lower Missouri River. To extend the comparison further, a Lake Superior harbor on our northwestern border handles 41,474,776 tons annually, or approximately 3,000 tons of actual commerce for every 1 of the 13,000 tons of actual freight carried on the Missouri.

RIVERS GET LIBERAL "PORK" ALLOWANCE.

The Duluth-Superior harbor tonnage for 1912 was several times as large as the combined traffic of the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers, yet the sundry civil bill waterway items and 1914 river bill carried \$21,676,000 for these three rivers, or more than one-third of the total amount of proposed waterway expenditures.

With this fact before us, it is passing strange to read a statement of the president of the Rivers and Harbors Congress made in another legislative body on September 14, as follows:

It does seem strange to me, and I have been thinking about it, not only now but for 16 years—ever since I entered Congress—that harbors could get all the money they needed while rivers had to struggle along and could get very little.

With approximately \$80,000,000 spent by the Government on the lower Mississippi and \$21,676,000 for three rivers in the 1914 bills, we may well weigh such utterances, because \$21,676,000 is more than the amount carried for all river and harbor appropriations in 1904, or more than double the total appropriations of 1905, when TILLMAN declared the "pork barrel" was a "humbug and steal."

OTHER RIVER PROJECTS.

While I have briefly alluded to the enormous expense to the Government because of nominal traffic on certain rivers, it must not be supposed that I have attempted to discuss many of the scandalous projects that have received the approval of Army engineers. Let me mention several others to keep them company:

THE ARKANSAS RIVER.

The Arkansas River has received over \$3,000,000 and an annual maintenance of \$30,000 is also paid by the Government. Deducting floatable timber it took \$95 of Government money in 1912 to convey every ton of miscellaneous freight an average distance of 34 miles. This computation allows only 3 per cent on the original investment. Compared with \$100 per ton on the Missouri and an equal amount on the Tennessee when the Muscle Shoals water power is completed, it will be observed that the Arkansas River is a better proposition, because the Arkansas has stood the test of time and saves \$5 per ton on the \$100 per ton estimates offered on the Missouri and Tennessee. But what a travesty!

THE RED RIVER.

The Red River below Fulton carries an appropriation every year for part of a stream that, according to the Engineers' Report, has received \$2,768,377 of Government money. Apart from floatable timber this river floated 1,227 tons of general merchandise during the year 1912—page 2314, report 1913—or an average of \$68 per ton cost to the Government, figuring interest on the investment at 3 per cent.

Another project appears in the Red River above Fulton that carried 236 tons of freight in 1913, aside from floatable timber, at a cost to the Government of \$59.50 per ton on an appropriation of \$465,729.

"The Red River above Fulton, Ark., is not navigable at ordinary low water for floating craft," says page 835, Engineers' Report 1913. Where did the \$465,729 go? Echo answers, Where?

THE BLACK WARRIOR.

In the RECORD, of June 19, page 11720, I gave a brief statement of the Black Warrior's absorption of \$9,151,295 of Government money. A computation was offered showing that approximately 5,450 tons average traffic through the various locks cost the Government \$396,546 in 1912, or a tidy sum of \$73 per ton. The Ouchita, Coosa, and many other streams tell the same tale.

I will only offer one more that comes in every bill:

THE BIG SANDY INVESTMENT.

Big Sandy River is one of the shining marks of waterway frauds that has received the approval of the engineering department. Deducting floatable timber, its 465 tons of miscellaneous freight in 1912 cost the Government in good Government money for interest and maintenance \$89,000, or a trifle over \$191 per ton.

I will not repeat facts surrounding many of the 26 North Carolina projects or of the twenty-odd Florida projects, including the Kissimmee and Oklawaha, or of Matawan Creek, Shoal Harbor, and other projects, including the never-to-be-forgotten Trinity and Brazos, that are found in every "pork barrel"—wasteful, indefensible projects, discredited by the engineers' reports that are offered in their support.

Newark Bay terminals, Jamaica Bay, and other real estate projects in the North evidence the fact that all of the successful promoters do not live in the South. Human nature appears to be much the same, and the protest against these projects and

exposure of their character comes from people of high standing familiar with the different propositions.

#### WASTEFUL CANALIZATION COMPARED TO PANAMA.

We are constantly reminded by the optimist waterway enthusiast that the Panama Canal shows possibilities of modern waterway extension, and we are invited to keep our eyes on the Panama Canal. The promoter of fake gold mines never fails to compare his projects with one having merit, and thousands of abandoned projects are ignored by gullible investors.

It may be said that while opinions differ as to the ultimate value of the Panama Canal to this country, it is now built, and between three and four hundred million dollars have been appropriated, because the American people were persuaded freight rates would be materially reduced by competing coastwise traffic.

After building the canal we have suddenly throttled all promised relief by repudiating our legislative pledge to the people and taxing the tonnage of our coastwise vessels. I am not here concerned with the political question, nor with charges of railway influences behind the repeal, but I am considering the Panama argument when applied to our inland waterways.

A reduction of freight rates is the premium held out to-day by dredgers and contractors, expressed through the lobby in return for waterway expenditures. What would these worthies say if we placed a tonnage tax on every steamboat or vessel that uses our waterways? And these waterways have cost more than double the amount expended on the Panama Canal, and all have been improved in expectation that the benefit, if any, would extend to the general public that pays the bills.

Great Lakes and ocean traffic grow, but rivers and creeks that absorb most of the barrel have lost their traffic and are no more feared by the railways than a seasoned veteran fears a child's toy whistle. Both are equally harmless and of equal value under present conditions. Notwithstanding our unsystematic, wasteful, political-pull methods, we are constantly referred to the possibilities of the Panama Canal and European canals, and when we question the infallibility of Army engineers, we are directed to Goethals. If he indorses the Muscle Shoals or other wasteful proposals, then we may well inquire what kind of an engineering school of instruction our Government supports.

I do not believe Goethals would approve such projects; but, if so, it adds nothing to the merit of the proposals.

#### ARGUMENTS FAVORING THE "PULL" SYSTEM.

My attention has been called to an article in the bulletin of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association charging that a Government report issued in 1909 has been discredited by changed conditions during the present year and says:

This is the sort of stuff the American people are expected to swallow about their priceless inheritance of waterways.

And the writer conclusively adds:

To put it plainly, most of the case against the Government river and harbor work that has appeared in print is reducible to one word—piffle.

Do the people who pay the tax believe the Muscle Shoals \$18,701,000 water-power proposition or the Coosa River \$6,000,000 water-power project or the Chattanooga water power or the Black Warrior water-power projects, which are being largely financed by the Government, are "piffle"?

Do the American people believe the president of the waterways congress, who admits on the floor of the Senate that a railway with 1,000 miles along the Mississippi is a contributor to the waterway lobby seeking to advance the "educational propaganda" for a land reclamation scheme along that river? If so, do they say "piffle" to the contributions of eight railway companies toward the same lobby for the same purpose?

#### BILLIONS PROPOSED IN WASTEFUL PROJECTS.

A writer complains in the same waterway magazine because of attacks on the pork barrel "just at a time when the restoration of traffic to our waterways is on the verge of accomplishment." Such defenders of the barrel should study Army engineers' reports and other records before asserting that waterway traffic on rivers is about to be restored. River traffic has steadily decreased, notwithstanding expenditures have amounted to \$80,000,000 on the lower Mississippi and proportionate expenditures on practically every other river and creek in the country.

It was proposed to appropriate \$21,676,000 in 1914 for three rivers that have been rapidly losing their commerce, as I have shown from the official reports. About \$80,000,000 more will be required for the Ohio and Missouri Rivers for a decreasing traffic, to be thereafter increased for new projects on the same rivers, while an unlimited amount will be required for the Mississippi land-reclamation project. Countless millions of

dollars are required for hundreds of other streams that have hopeful new projects knocking at the Treasury doors with estimates reaching into hundreds of millions of dollars. The restoration of river traffic is indefinitely removed from "the verge of accomplishment," and if a halt is to be called in the present reckless haphazard, wasteful lack of system now is an opportune time when people who pay war taxes are scrutinizing appropriations.

#### INVESTIGATE THE WHOLE SUBJECT.

I am inclined to offer a further suggestion regarding arguments made in defense of such bad bills. Champions of the bill in the recent lobby session professed to find improper purposes behind those who fight against this annual waste. They object to a careful, systematic investigation of the subject by a competent board for fear some local project may not get past the board. Special interests whisper their suspicions and they are embraced by those who should know better. Ignoring the fact that every State now has or should have a railway commission which, in conjunction with the Interstate Commerce Commission, regulates freight rates and prevents unreasonable earnings, we continue to hear of the railway bugaboo and are told that opposition to a wasteful pork barrel probably springs from railway influences. Blind to the fact or ignorant of the fact that railways own or control many of the waterway lines on river and sea and practically all terminals at many points, these critics profess to believe that such improvements by the Government, primarily for railways, are in some unaccountable way for the benefit of the public.

With equal disregard for the logic of the situation such critics profess to believe that railways are opposed to wasteful river projects, notwithstanding subscription lists showing amounts subscribed by different railways are published showing railways and other special interests are among the most generous contributors to the lobby.

Dredgers, contractors, land reclamationists, water-power interests, and railway companies all join in pushing the lobby, yet their aid is accepted by highly respectable people in this copartnership carnival for Government money.

High-class journals are advised that some local project may be imperiled by a defeat of the "pork barrel" or by opening up the subject, and so heavy editorials from distinguished writers are aimed at opponents of the bill. What matters it if the \$21,000,000 and over contained in the 1914 bill for the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio is largely wasted? What matters it if the Alabama Water Power Co. has received millions for the Coosa and Black Warrior and other streams, and is about to get \$18,701,000 more for Muscle Shoals? What matters it that real estate, water-power, and reclamation projects jostle each other throughout the \$50,000,000 "humbbug and steal," providing the local project is kept in?

And these same highly respectable journals that denounce Congress for acts of omission or commission are found criticizing opposition to the "pork barrel" because some local project is in the barrel or some day is to be placed there.

Personally, I am not disturbed over charges of railway influence behind the opposition. For many years I aided in a small way to secure the passage of laws which gave my own State complete control of public carriers, and laws which also broke up a disgraceful secret lobby that had haunted the State capitol for years, as bad and vicious as the "pork-barrel" lobby which haunts the National Capitol to-day.

No railway official in my own State nor anyone familiar with that legislation will question the motives that prompt me now.

The railways of that State are now free from sandbagging and unjust legislative treatment and find in the very laws which control their activities the protection to which they are entitled. And what applies to railways in that State applies with equal force to the proposal to place waterway improvements of the country in the hands of a high-class board that shall be substituted for political pull.

#### WHO ARE THE RAILROADS HIDING BEHIND?

When Colliers, Harpers, La Follettes, Piersons, Saturday Evening Post, National, World's Work, Outlook, and other journals of recognized high public purpose open their columns to the truth about "pork barrels" or editorially condemn the present system we may fairly question the character of men who charge unworthy motives lie behind opposition to a scandalous diversion of public funds.

When the Chicago Tribune in the West, the Christian Science Monitor in the East, and scores of journals of equally high character throughout the country lambast that same infamous bill and the legislative easy conscience that finds apology for its existence, what are the standards of \$50,000,000 lobby orators who question the motives of the opposition? Misrepresenta-



tion by those ignorant of the facts or by men convicted of a perversion of truth are not calculated to deceive thinking people. In order that no one may be misled by this patent attempt to distract attention from the real issue I have tried to secure an investigation of the lobby's influence. A resolution to that end has been referred to the committee. In my remarks appearing in the October Record of the 8th abundant evidence was offered of improper influences from dredgers, contractors, railways, and other interests to put through the 1914 barrel.

FIND OUT WHAT THE RAILROADS ARE SUPPORTING.

Now, let us get together and demand that the resolution be reported and that investigators further be instructed to ascertain what influences, if any, other than a sense of legislative responsibility, exists behind the opposition. Let us have no more hypocritical cant about improper influences alleged to actuate men and journals now engaged in this warfare against a gigantic waste of public funds. To use a common homely expression, the \$50,000,000 champions should lay their cards on the table and demand an investigation that will include themselves and the opponents of the barrel. If they refuse, how can they avoid the legitimate conclusion?

The country is entitled to facts, and facts may easily be had through an investigation. I have shown that special interests are largely responsible for the lobby and have presented irrefutable evidence on the subject. Why answer direct testimony with idle talk that it is "piffle," when an investigation will disclose the facts and influences surrounding both the supporters and opponents of this bad bill?

A THANKLESS JOB.

Many people believe the Rivers and Harbors Committee has made mistakes in judgment, and I feel sure that such is the opinion of the general public that pays the wasteful \$50,000,000 bills; but the fault is not individual. It is due to a pernicious system fastened on to Congress by years of placid acquiescence. I further realize that the committee is made up of a hard-worked body of men who try to do justice between different clamoring interests, and that it is composed of able men who are responsible to the House and who perform a difficult and unenviable task to the best of their ability. It is equally unquestioned that the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee is filling an arduous position with great skill and fairness, and further, that Congress, and not the committee, is responsible for the system. I make this acknowledgment because criticism of the system and of projects is intended to be impersonal. Possibly the high opinion I have of the chairman and members of the committee is not reciprocated because of my attacks on the result of their labors. If not, it is a matter of personal regret, but can not affect my desire to expose waste, as I view it, nor my efforts, however feeble, to try and urge a better legislative system.

CHANGE THE LEGISLATIVE SYSTEM.

No difficulty ought to be experienced in finding a better plan than the present one, but before Congress will consent to a change it is necessary to make the present system so odious that Members will be anxious to repudiate it. Human nature is selfish, and as long as the insistence of getting something for nothing prevails it will be useless to look for a thorough reform. With safety locks on vault doors and carefully guarded plates from which Government money is printed, the burglar and the counterfeiter are constantly engaged, seeking to avoid law and the protection afforded by public servants. The system of compelling Army engineers to approve projects was once of some value in staying the greed of local communities, but it has illy served its purpose when in recent years so many notoriously bad projects receive the approval of the Army board. Admitting, for argument's sake, that the board is only carrying out the demands of Members or Senators for allowance of unworthy projects, the situation is not helped by present conditions. How can political pull, vicious schemes, and special interests be blocked? Evils can be reduced by having the Engineer Department perform its proper function of reporting upon and constructing engineering projects. An administration which is responsible for governmental expenditures, including those for the post office, Army, and Navy, for instance, makes recommendations from the heads of departments. The President is held responsible for wasted Government money, for improper Government expenditures, and properly so, because, through his Secretaries or heads of departments, he can control the amounts to be expended and to be submitted to Congress by his subordinates.

A HIGH-CLASS WATERWAY BOARD.

Such recommendations are largely followed by Congress, and, although Philadelphia, Brooklyn, and Podunk Creek may squabble over local shipyards and gnaw over bones thrown into bills

calling for local improvements, as a whole bills are accepted largely as recommended. In order to give the administration a right to have a voice in such expenditures and an intelligent part in the national budget system, we might authorize the appointment of a board of waterways by the President, to which board all proposed projects should be submitted before being placed on the bill. Such board might properly include the Secretary of Labor and two other Cabinet officers, possibly the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior. This board should be supplemented by two or more engineers, preferably from both civil and Army life. A board of this character would invite confidence, and its approval of a project could reasonably be credited to public service and not to special interests. All projects should thereafter be passed upon by Congress as in other appropriation bills.

CONTRIBUTION SHOULD BE COMPELLED.

Pressure now brought to bear on the engineering department and upon Congress will be minimized by insisting that communities, with rare exceptions, be compelled to contribute their share to any improvement. Why should the Dakotas, Wyoming, and many other States contribute to a waterway calculated only to benefit a particular locality or possibly some transportation company? More specifically stated, why should not the people of Missouri be asked to pay their part of a \$20,000,000 burden for a Missouri River project?

In suggesting this illustration I am engaged in a violent assumption that there is merit in a project that will cost \$100 per ton to accommodate traffic. That question having been determined in the affirmative, why should not Kansas City, which is expecting particular local benefits, pay for that benefit? The dredgers, contractors, and special interests now behind different projects would then use their activities toward convincing the good people of Kansas City that there is genuine merit in such a project. If Missouri contributed \$5,000,000 to the project and Kansas City and communities along the river contributed an additional \$5,000,000, the Government would be saved half of the project cost, and improvements would be for actual waterways. The principle of contribution applied to road highways should govern Federal aid to waterways.

A high-class board would seek to aid any community that had a project of value. Where a public use is had that is of national importance the proposition of contribution could be modified, but taking the largest harbor and most generally recognized public waterway of international importance—New York Harbor—and we find the city of New York received \$4,500,000 annually from its terminal privileges and could presumably fairly make some contribution to that part of the public work which is primarily of local benefit. To-day it contributes liberally to all wasteful projects contained in "pork barrels" and fights to secure appropriations for the greatest harbor in the world.

ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY.

These are suggestions to indicate how the vicious system can be avoided and how every legitimate waterway improvement may receive aid from the Government. A saving in the amount of vicious waterway improvements reaching from \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000 could probably be brought about, most of the present waste eliminated, and we may well believe no legitimate waterway would suffer because of the change.

Every existing project ought to be critically examined by this expert board. Projects that are of no commercial or actual value, like the Hennepin Canal, Muscle Shoals, Trinity River, and scores of other wasteful Government investments, would be subjected to business instead of political considerations.

The Appropriations Committee could presumably handle the whole budget system far better than a number of committees working without coordination or a common purpose. However, I would not complicate the proposal by suggesting changes that every business man realizes should be made in a wasteful system. Any action along the line I have suggested will improve present conditions, and until such action is had we will be constantly menaced by a "pork barrel" and a "pork-barrel" lobby. These few remarks have been offered to call attention particularly to a few of the bad projects that have been approved by Army engineers and to urge upon Members generally the desirability of demanding a thorough investigation of the merit of every item before the measure is again railroaded through the House. Let us not admit that the Senate is more careful in its legislative methods than ourselves. Whatever the facts may be, let us not be prevented from doing our full duty either through the influence of a \$50,000,000 annual lobby or through any mistaken sense of legislative courtesy for bad projects or their supporters.

I have monopolized more time than I expected to take on this subject, but I desire to say that I am not opposed, nor is any Member whom I have heard, who has criticized items or criticized the bill—we are not opposed to waterway projects. We are not opposed to Government aid to waterway projects. We believe a high-class commission should be appointed, so as to do away with the present system, which brings 11 high-grade Members of Congress before a board of Army engineers. I could give other illustrations where engineers' decisions have been changed, necessarily so, and we as men all know it. I am not criticizing the men who go there, because they are all anxious about particular projects; but I criticize the system, and trust that with these expositions we may at some time get a different system. And I am offering it with that idea; and while personalities have been directed at me, and unfairly so when I could not reply, I will not engage in them at this time nor at any other time, because there is no personal feeling with me on this matter. I believe the system is wrong. I know it is wrong, and every Member in this House knows it is wrong. Whether we can correct it I do not know. I believe we may improve it, and that is the purpose of the suggestions which have been made here at different times by myself. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I was not surprised to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] close his remarks by protesting his innocence of any feeling against any portion of the people or section of country in any of these matters. It always happens that when the virus is in a man's heart, he protests its absence.

I have been a Member of this House a number of years, and I have never in all my life heard the discussion of a bill from so purely a sectional standpoint as the gentleman has discussed this measure here to-day. I have never heard a statement attempted upon this floor in reference to the situation as to certain rivers and harbors in the country so thoroughly erroneous in all my life as this. I have never heard in all my life such an unjust, such an unfair arraignment of the rivers and harbors as we have just heard upon this floor, and of the Army engineers of the United States.

Mr. NELSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Not now. I was once a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. I have voted on every bill that has been in the House for 17 or 18 years. I am sure it has always afforded me pleasure to vote for the improvement of the rivers in the North and of the West. The South has had but little of this improvement through all of the Republican Congresses, and but little since. I do not believe this is "Yankee money" that has been referred to. It is the money of the people of the United States that we are to expend.

Mr. FREAR. That was not my expression; it was in a southern editorial.

Mr. MOON. It is the money of the United States. The people of the United States have a right and ought to place it wherever it will do the most good. I have long since grown weary and tired of either the direct or the inferential sectionalism displayed on the floor of this House. If this was not an Alabama or a Tennessee proposition we would not have heard from the gentleman in regard to it.

Mr. FREAR. I spoke about the Ohio River.

Mr. MOON. I am coming to the Ohio River. The gentleman spoke of the Ohio River, when he knew, if he knew anything, that of a \$60,000,000 project for the Ohio every dollar is practically secured under a continuing contract, and nothing that he could do or say would alter it. The gentleman did not tell this House that the objections he makes against the improvement of the southern rivers was not made against the Monongahela, the Allegheny, the Delaware, or the Ohio, or the upper part of the Mississippi River which lies in the Western and Northern States. But whenever we ask something, after his section has gotten all it wants, after it has gotten all that it needs, then he is obsessed of that infernal idea that has always cursed this country—that nothing good can come out of the Treasury for anything south of Mason and Dixon's line. That is the attitude that the gentleman puts himself in.

Now, I am not going to discuss all these matters, but I am going to take up one. The gentleman talks about the Tennessee River not being worthy of improvement.

Mr. FREAR. I did not say so.

Mr. MOON. You oppose it. We have many obstructions in that river which destroy its commerce and navigation and which ought to be removed. But the gentleman speaks against the judgment and the sentiment of Congresses for 50 years, against the judgment of engineers of the United States, and the

gentleman assumes a wonderful superiority of knowledge of commercial statistics, and a wonderful knowledge of engineering and navigation superior to every engineer of the United States. The whole trend of his argument is that way, and it means nothing else. He sets up his judgment against these men of experience, these men of judgment, these men of ability, these men of business—men who know more about these great questions in 1 minute than he could in 10 years—and he asks this House to follow his judgment along these lines.

Now let us see about the Tennessee River for a moment. There was a stretch below Chattanooga of this river of some 40 miles that was navigable, but very dangerous, only a few months in the year. The cooperative plan, similar to that proposed for the Muscle Shoals, was invoked, and this Congress, when Mr. BURTON was chairman, passed a bill for the improvement of that section of the river. The Government made a slight contribution, and the power company made possible the navigation that could not have existed without it; and that company spent \$10,000,000, which under the law of this country the Government ought to have expended in the interest of navigation.

The gentleman makes the absurd and ridiculous proposition that only 5,500 tons of phosphate passes through the canal, assuming that this is all the commerce of that river or on that stretch of the river. How utterly nonsensical a suggestion that is shown by the fact that the tonnage is 1,300,000 tons annually, worth more than \$13,000,000 of money, that passes over the river. The river is cut in two by obstruction that must be removed. The gentleman says that Mr. BURTON agrees with him about this, but I do not think he does. But Mr. BURTON was the chairman of the committee that recommended the river improvement. What do you expect, gentlemen? Do you expect the river to be already improved before you offer any contributions to it? If that were true, it would not be necessary to make the appropriation. Here is a river upon which commerce is practicable between given points, but it has obstructions that must be removed to make it all available. Why, on that river there are coal fields of seven States. There is enough coal, according to the geological report, along this river and States tributary to it that if you could market the whole of it would support a population of a hundred million people in the lavish use of it for a thousand years. What are you going to do with the agricultural products along the river? What are you going to do with the immense marble interests, the immense timber interests, the great ore and manufacturing interests all along the river? If it is not improved, they can not get to the world. Mankind can not have the benefit of them. We have a short period in the year when you can pass through the whole river two boats running to St. Louis. You know that the reduction on account of those boats during that brief period in the railroad freight rates is about one-third.

When the river is not open the railroad puts up its rates, and when the river is open so that a partial commerce can pass through, it puts down its rates. And what sort of a river is this that I am talking about? It is a river which with main stem and tributaries would benefit and put into navigation, with the improvements asked for, 2,260 miles of navigable water—a river that empties more water by 60,000 gallons per minute into the Ohio River than the Ohio and the Cumberland Rivers both have together. Then talk about it not being worthy of improvement!

Now, let us talk of the Muscle Shoals matter. I am not willing to see any unfair arrangement made in reference to the Muscle Shoals proposition, one in which the Government can not possibly lose anything; but that is an obstruction that must be gotten rid of. The United States canal, a long and tortuous canal, is inefficient, ineffective in its work, and has to be replaced either by locks and dams or by a new canal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, it will take \$9,000,000 of money to put that canal in shape. Is the gentleman willing to have \$9,000,000 of money thrown away on that river? That is the proposition, not for the benefit of Tennessee alone, but for the benefit of the commerce of the world. Are you going to throw it away? I think not. Is it better to put \$9,000,000 into the restoration of an ineffective system than to put \$9,000,000—\$8,000,000 the engineers say—into the construction of locks and dams? Is it unwise if the power plant must be constructed to the extent of twenty-odd millions of dollars, for the Government, when it gets the full benefit of the navigation, to contribute \$8,000,000? Is it not best that the Government do that rather than restore this old canal? The gentleman says that



\$3,000,000 will be advanced for the construction of this project outside of the \$8,000,000. Grant that that is true. It is to be returned, and the interest upon the whole project paid to the Government of the United States.

I think that in view of the fact that on a project at Hales Bar the Government of the United States was given by the people who constructed it \$10,000,000, it comes with poor grace for any man to say that a people who are willing to make such contributions to the Government, when you in the North were getting it all without any contribution, should not have the benefit of appropriations that are necessary for that interest there. Of course, the details of the bill in reference to this matter can not be discussed at this time. The proposition ought to be carried through as the engineers have said, in my judgment, at the Muscle Shoals. The Government ought to be protected in every respect as it is at Hales Bar. If you want to do it, you can take over the whole of the project at Hales Bar either upon its valuation at the present time or upon its cost. It is useless for gentlemen to be obsessed of an idea in opposition to a policy and to see nothing except that which is in the line of vision they want to see. If there is a river in these United States that is to be improved, if there is one that is worthy of improvement, it is the Tennessee River. All of the reports and the statistics show it, and the idle suggestion that Muscle Shoals is intended for nothing, and has accomplished no other purpose than the carrying through of a few thousand tons of phosphate, must be apparent when lying along the banks of that great river in seven States tributary to it, are the greatest resources in all this great Republic. The gentleman must not go to the engineers' reports and garble statements from them and put his interpretation upon those statements. He must not put into the mouths of the engineers of the United States that which would falsify their written reports. It is neither just to them nor is it just to this House. Truly there could be no higher board, one more efficient or competent, to pass upon the great questions involved here than the engineers of the United States.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. I was going to ask is not this the first case, according to the report of the engineers, where they have ever made such a proposition to the Government?

Mr. MOON. As what?

Mr. FREAR. That they would enter into partnership with a water-power company for the promotion of this enterprise.

Mr. MOON. No; the water-power proposition is only incidental.

Mr. FREAR. I am asking if that is not the first case?

Mr. MOON. No; the Hales Bar case was one.

Mr. FREAR. That is what they say in their report.

Mr. MOON. I drew the bill for the Hales Bar proposition, and it passed this House and I know what was in it, and the record there shows the Government's participation—small, it is true.

Mr. FREAR. I accept the gentleman's statement in preference to that of the report.

Mr. MOON. It is almost impossible, to get down to practical questions, to get great projects of this sort through without the cooperation of these motor-power companies. I am not in favor of the Government making any bad contract with anybody. I am in favor of a provision in this bill which would turn over all this water power to the Government, if the Government wants to use it, and I am in favor of a proposition that would secure to the people protection against exorbitant rates. You speak of conservation. The greatest conservation proposition on the face of the earth is the Muscle Shoals proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, that is the greatest conservation proposition in the world—560,000 horsepower. Not only to light, but to operate the machinery in thousands of factories in all that great Tennessee Valley, and you say it ought not to be conserved, do you, because the Government itself has not the power nor the interest at this time to promote it? You would let it run to waste as it has for centuries, when these power companies ask us to conserve it in order that they may give rates 40 to 50 per cent cheaper than power generated by coal would give to the people in the great manufacturing centers of that section. Are you unwilling to have that great power developed and promoted?

Mr. FREAR. Is it not true that in the statement made before the committee by gentlemen behind this proposition they ad-

mitted there is no demand at this time for the use of this power? That is the statement made, according to the press account. It is simply preliminary?

Mr. MOON. I heard the gentleman make the statement. He said there would be a demand; that there was in part a demand now. Just like the improvement of rivers, you can not tell what the commerce of a river is going to be until you open it up to navigation. You can not tell what the electric power will be until you are in a position to develop it. He believes, and I believe, and I have heard Mr. Worthington say time and again the benefits that would come from it would be incalculable. If they are willing to put in twenty-odd millions of money in cooperation with the Government, it surely argues that they believe there is an outcome to it. Do you suppose private persons would put twenty-odd millions of dollars in cooperation with the Government without power rights when the Government is to put in nothing more finally than necessary for the purpose of navigation?

Mr. NELSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. I do.

Mr. NELSON. Does the gentleman believe that is a good policy for the Government, to go into partnership with corporations and extend it throughout the country?

Mr. MOON. I believe, as President Roosevelt said when the lock-and-dam bill passed, that it is the best possible means for conservation of these powers in the whole country. You have got it to-day. Under the Hales Bar law the Government not only controls the plant, but inspects it regularly, has its men over the locks to be operated for the purpose of navigation free to the Government, with the provision that the Government may, if it sees fit, take over the whole thing, auxiliaries and all. That is the only way you are going to develop this country. You can not get this Government to put thirty millions of money in a plant of that sort, but if the Government needs an expenditure of \$8,000,000 of money for the purpose of creating navigation where it will make proper return to the people, it is wise that you take in connection with it a power plant or any others that will serve the great public interest there and prevent it from being destroyed, because it all rests in the Government hands at last. I agree very readily with those ideas that we should separate our Government from all individual or corporate interest everywhere. I do not agree, however, that the Government is not capable of taking care of itself if in the legislation it enacts it gives an advantage and benefit to the Government that it ought to have. We can not keep ourselves as a government and an institution here at Washington, the Congress and the Executive, aloof and away from the people. We have to go down to the people and help in these matters, that benefit may come to the country. It is not a benefit that is to come to one State only, nor to the seven States that are tributary to that river. It is a benefit that is to come to your whole country. Where you bring from the West to the South small grain and other crops over this river, now in part open for a short time, an immense tide might flow from the West of your crops for distribution to the South, and might carry back some of the products of the South if this waterway was open the year around. You can not justify yourselves under any circumstances in a parsimonious or narrow view of a great public question like this. I do not care if it is in one section; our whole country will get the full benefit of the result of the improvement. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the engineers in the Army, in my opinion, constitute the most select body of professional men of ability that can be found anywhere in the world. They are appointed as cadets at West Point and go through services there. The poorest in the class are not selected as engineers, and their training, when they become engineers, is to act upon the merits of a proposition, wholly disregarding pressure and political influence. It may be and probably is the fact that sometimes they yield to the pressure of circumstances, but when they do it is entirely from having their opinions changed by facts which are brought before them. It is a great mistake, in my judgment, for anyone opposed to a river and harbor bill to base the opposition to it upon the lack either of ability, integrity, or knowledge of affairs on the part of the engineers. I have been up against them on a number of occasions when I thought I had a perfect case, and I was not able to convince the engineers; and I simply wish to express my opinion, in connection with the remarks which have been made here to-day, that the Engineer Corps of the United States Army, among the professional bodies which I know of, in my judgment stands the highest. But I hope there

will be no river and harbor bill this year. There was not very much of a one last year. On computations which I have recently made, and which I think are fairly accurate, it seems to me almost a certainty that the Government is likely to issue bonds before the 1st of next July to pay the current expenses. I presume the Government would be able to sell 3 per cent Panama bonds by threatening the banks with destruction in some form if they did not buy them. They can not sell them on the market as a matter of purchase of securities, because the 3 per cent bonds without the circulation privilege are not worth par. Would not it be the part of wisdom in Congress, with the threat and almost certainty of a deficit before it, to postpone the consideration of propositions which can, at least, wait without injury? That it may be desirable to make public improvements in places can be granted without at the same time assuming that there will be any special injury to the public by the postponement of such public works. There are many public improvements desirable; there are many public buildings desirable; there are many harbor improvements and river improvements desirable; but we have gotten along fairly well up to date without those which have not yet been started.

I think we will find it better, and probably more popular, to postpone these improvements than to a year from now continue the war-tax law and increase the taxes at the same time. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Does the gentleman from Iowa wish to use any more of his time now?

Mr. GOOD. May I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOOD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I ought to impose myself on the committee, and I will do so only for a short space of five minutes, in order to say that I am opposed to reckless and extravagant expenditure of public funds. But wherever there is a meritorious project, or where navigation can be created by Government expenditure, and sufficient evidence can be adduced to show that the improvement is one which will enhance the facilities for the movement of the products of the field and the farm and the mine and the factory, the Government ought not to hesitate to make that improvement; and if, perchance, while the Government is creating means for transporting the commodities of the country, it can at the same time create by the expenditure of private capital hydroelectric energy which will encourage the investment of capital in new enterprises on account of the cheapness of the electrical energy that can be supplied for the operation of factories, there ought not to be any reason why the Government should not expend its contribution in connection with the expenditure of money by private individuals; for, after all, it seems to me the best way to conserve the resources of the country is to develop these resources so that they may be placed at the disposal of the people of the country.

We have a great waterfall here and an abundant quantity of water running down to the sea every day unharnessed which might well be utilized for the operation of the factories between here and Baltimore and the lighting of this great city as well as the lighting of the city of Baltimore. And it can not well be said that the resources that are embraced in this waterfall, while they are being allowed to run to the sea, are being conserved. I believe it should be the policy of the Government, including the Congress, to utilize, and by utilizing thus conserve our resources in order to create hydroelectric energy everywhere that can be sold at a low price, giving the Government officials the right to regulate the price, and that if this hydroelectric energy can not be created in any other way than by the expenditure of private money in cooperation with the Government in its attempt to create navigation for the transportation of the Nation's commodities, the Government ought to cooperate, but no expenditure of public money should be made in an attempt to create navigation in places where navigation never can be possible. But wherever navigation is possible by water the Government should do its part to enable the development of resources bordering on the waterway to be improved and thereby give to the people of America that kind of conservation which means the utilization of the forces of nature and an opportunity to develop what mankind may be able to produce out of nature. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Does the gentleman want to use any other time now?

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I shall not occupy more than a few moments of the time of the committee for the purpose of explaining briefly the report that has been submitted. The legislative bill for the current year carries \$37,625,789.70, which includes \$246,860 carried in the deficiency and other appropriation bills and which are taken up in this bill. The estimates upon which this bill is based called for \$40,727,518.27. The bill as reported carries \$38,744,753.50. It provides for 16,708 salaries, and includes \$2,236,100 for the purpose of taking an agricultural census. Under section 31 of the act of July 22, 1909, which provided for the Thirteenth Decennial Census, it was provided that in the year 1915 and every 10 years thereafter there should be taken a census of agriculture and live stock. As this item must be provided for only one time in each 10 years, it is but fair to the committee that made up this bill that it should be eliminated from our comparisons. Eliminating this item and comparing the bill as we present it to the House with the bill for the current year providing for similar Government expenditures the bill appropriates \$1,167,156 less than was appropriated for the same service for the present fiscal year.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Yes, sir.

Mr. GILLETT. How does it compare with the bill of last year as reported from the committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I have not the figures before me as the bill was reported from the committee last year, but I think as the bill finally passed it carried at least \$800,000 more than it did when the committee reported it.

Mr. GILLETT. My impression is that the bill as reported this year is larger than the bill reported last year.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. No; it is not larger than the bill reported last year, in my judgment, though I have not the figures before me.

Mr. GILLETT. I will get the figures.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The bill as reported now carries \$1,165,000 less than the current law. I am sure that much was not added to the bill in the House or in the Senate. This bill provides for 187 fewer salaries than the bill for the current law provides for and 270 less than the estimates called for. In the Post Office Department there has been a marked and a gratifying decrease. Notwithstanding the usual and rapid growth of the Postal Service the clerical force asked for in the Post Office Department for the next fiscal year is \$75,680 less than we appropriated for the current year. A further substantial reduction is found in the office of the Auditor for the Post Office Department under the Secretary of the Treasury. We appropriate \$28,850 less and for 40 less places. Since 1913, notwithstanding the very great increase in the amounts that must be audited by the Auditor for the Post Office Department there has been a reduction of 355 statutory places and a total reduction of \$134,120 in the amount used in that office. A year ago we were asked for a very large increase in the office of the Treasurer of the United States, due to the new method of accounting inaugurated by Mr. MacVeagh in February, 1913. The system at first threw the Treasurer's office into great confusion. The Committee on Appropriations did not, however, grant the increase asked for, and we are now pleased to report to Congress that the work in the office of the Treasurer of the United States is current, and instead of asking for an increase there is a decrease of 26 persons, and a total decrease of \$22,000 in the amount appropriated.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee as to the means whereby these economies were obtained, whether by the installation of labor-saving devices in the Post Office Department or not?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. In the Post Office Department it was by use of the electric tabulating machines for the auditing of money orders, which amount, I think, to more than three millions a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. What was the occasion for the diminution in the Treasury Department?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. As I stated a moment ago, about a year ago the new system which Mr. MacVeagh put into operation just before he retired from the office of Secretary of the Treasury had not been tried out, and there was necessarily more or less confusion; but since the plans have all been perfected, and new methods and business improvements have been adopted, they have not only been enabled to get along with the force they had a year ago, but they have asked, as I



said a moment ago, for 26 persons less for the next fiscal year, and the work of the office is growing.

Another reduction of \$126,200 is due to the largely decreased work in the Pension Office. We appropriate for 88 persons less than were appropriated for in the current year. We made no reduction below the estimates in the Pension Office for this year, although we were accused of having done so. We provided for the Pension Office just the number of people that the Commissioner of Pensions asked for. We have provided in this bill for all that he asked for except five places. The five places that were omitted by the Committee on Appropriations are five places that are outside of the classified service, and the persons who hold them are appointed for one year only, so that when they are appointed they have no assurance of being retained longer than that fiscal year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that with that statement, together with what information I shall be able to give as we proceed under the five-minute rule, it is not necessary for me to trespass longer upon the attention of the committee. I may say, though, for the benefit of Members, that in the State Department, the Navy Department, the War Department, and the Department of Justice there is not a single change from the current law. There is nothing that will provoke discussion or call for amendment. The only changes of consequence made in the bill are in the two Departments of Commerce and Labor. The appropriations for both of those departments are increased over the appropriation for the current year. In the office of the Comptroller of the Currency, in the Treasury, it was also found necessary slightly to increase the force on account of the increased activities of that office by reason of the Federal reserve law. With those exceptions the bill is practically current law. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full compensation for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, namely:

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, there was a quasi understanding before we went into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to the effect that this bill would be discussed in general debate for the balance of the day. The time was not all taken up, and I did hope that we could read a few pages of the bill to-day; but I do not care that it should be done without the consent of everybody, and I therefore move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 19909) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### REPORT OF ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:  
*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Annual Report of the Isthmian Canal Commission and the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 14, 1914.

PURCHASE AND EXCHANGE OF TYPEWRITING MACHINES, STATE DEPARTMENT (H. DOC. NO. 1355).

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I inclose herewith a statement submitted by the Secretary of State, in compliance with the requirements of section 4 of the legislative act approved July 16, 1914, of typewriting machines purchased and exchanged for the first three months of the current fiscal year.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 14, 1914.

#### REPORT OF THE DOORKEEPER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (H. DOC. NO. 1356).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the annual report of the Doorkeeper of the House, transmitting an inventory of all property in his charge belonging to the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Accounts for filing.

#### REIMBURSEMENT TO ARMY OFFICERS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following communication from the Secretary of War, which was read and referred to the Committee on Claims:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL OF THE ARMY,  
Washington, December 10, 1914.

The SPEAKER,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: There were submitted with the estimates for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, the following measures for reimbursement of the officers named of the amounts sets opposite each for the loss of mounds by fire and other causes, viz:

Relief of Lieut. H. E. Miner.....	\$160
Relief of Maj. H. E. Ely.....	200
Relief of Lieut. Sloan Doak.....	150
Relief of Lieut. J. A. Barry.....	135
Relief of Lieut. Waldo C. Potter.....	375
Relief of Lieut. J. F. Taubee.....	200

These items will be found on page 336 of the Book of Estimates, 1916.

During the hearing of the Quartermaster General before the House Committee on Military Affairs on the Army bill for 1916 the chairman of the committee stated that, in his opinion, these measures could not properly be acted upon by that committee, but should be presented to the Committee on Claims. It is therefore requested that the estimates in question be withdrawn from the House Committee on Military Affairs and transmitted to the House Committee on Claims.

Respectfully,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,  
Secretary of War.

Mr. MANN. This letter should be referred, Mr. Speaker. I think that is sufficient. Claims have no place in the estimates, anyhow.

The SPEAKER. Yes. The letter is referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON] asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to give notice that we would like to pass this legislative bill to-morrow, if we can keep the Members on the floor.

Mr. MANN. You can not expect to pass it to-morrow.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is aware of the fact that we are to take a recess before dinner to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. We have a night session to-morrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Very well.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 15, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting statement showing the travel of all officials and employees who have traveled on official business to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1351); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Acting Secretary of the Navy reporting list of claims for damages for which the vessels of the Navy were found to be responsible (H. Doc. No. 1352); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting list of cases filed under the French spoliation act (Jan. 20, 1885) which have been dismissed by the court for want of sufficient evidence (H. Doc. No. 1353); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of the annual inspection of the several branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers made by Maj. W. P.

Jackson, inspector general (H. Doc. No. 1354); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. WEBB, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 94) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1222), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. MCKENZIE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19497) to amend the military record of George W. Laland, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1220), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15382) granting a pension to Harry V. Hafner; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 17001) granting an increase of pension to Albert Kneller; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 19906) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 19907) to incorporate the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 19908) to provide for an additional authorization of money to be used in the construction of a public building at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 19909) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 19910) to increase the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GILLET: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 385) for a commemoration of the second inaugural of Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Resolution (H. Res. 674) to print 2,000 additional copies of the soil survey of the Connecticut Valley; to the Committee on Printing.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 19911) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 19912) granting a pension to America Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19913) granting an increase of pension to Giles Swan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 19914) granting a pension to James M. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 19915) granting a pension to Malinda A. Brooks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19916) granting a pension to Jennie Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19917) granting an increase of pension to Butler Bond; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19918) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Dutoit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 19919) granting a pension to Joseph Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 19920) granting a pension to W. B. Showalter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19921) granting an increase of pension to John W. Ogden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19922) granting an increase of pension to B. Franklin Harrod; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19923) granting an increase of pension to J. S. Blackwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 19924) granting an increase of pension to William Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 19925) granting a pension to Theodore E. Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19926) granting a pension to Thomas F. Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19927) granting an increase of pension to Emiline R. Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 19928) granting a pension to Eliza Bridges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19929) granting an increase of pension to Harry Wilkey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19930) granting an increase of pension to James Scroggins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19931) granting an increase of pension to Eugene L. Sheftall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19932) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester D. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19933) granting an increase of pension to David Reeder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19934) granting an increase of pension to Hudson Lamkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19935) granting an increase of pension to John M. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19936) granting an increase of pension to John Schmaltz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19937) granting an increase of pension to Singleton Albert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19938) granting an increase of pension to Mary McKee Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19939) granting an increase of pension to William L. Webber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 19940) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19941) granting an increase of pension to Richard Dunmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19942) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Grant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 19943) granting a pension to Sarah E. Wirth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19944) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Bennett C. Fuller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 19945) granting an increase of pension to Carl F. Jensen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 19946) for the relief of Dennis Frenger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 19947) granting a pension to Hiley Underwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 19948) granting an increase of pension to David Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 19949) granting an increase of pension to Frances J. Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 19950) granting an increase of pension to John Elsbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 19951) granting an increase of pension to John Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 19952) granting a pension to Willie E. Terry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19953) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius Meek; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LESHNER: A bill (H. R. 19954) granting an increase of pension to Andrew D. Seely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 19955) for the relief of the West Baltimore Building Association; to the Committee on Claims.



By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 19956) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Hoary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 19957) granting an increase of pension to Stephen B. Garrigus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19958) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Tichenor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 19959) granting a pension to Ellen Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PROUTY: A bill (H. R. 19960) granting an increase of pension to James T. Thrasher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 19961) granting a pension to Fred M. Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19962) granting an increase of pension to William B. Jenness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 19963) granting a pension to Mary E. Roseberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19964) granting an increase of pension to John Canote; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 19965) granting an increase of pension to Erick Lawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 19966) granting a pension to Charles E. Hilliard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19967) granting an increase of pension to William S. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19968) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19969) granting an increase of pension to William A. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19970) granting an increase of pension to Preston C. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19971) granting an increase of pension to Daniel H. Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 19972) granting an increase of pension to Minor M. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 19973) for the relief of the legal representatives of Robert G. Crozier; to the Committee on War Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AUSTIN: Memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kingston, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Petitions of William McKillip, O. J. Fay, T. H. Suckling, F. J. Wolf, Frank Glessner, and the Diamond Hardware Co., all of Hollidaysburg, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 5308, taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL of California: Memorial of Long Beach (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring House joint resolution 372, providing for a national security commission to inquire into the question of the preparedness of the United States for war; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRODBECK: Petition of 118 people of Delta, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Badger Press, of Milwaukee, and the Lakeside Printing Co., of Racine, Wis., protesting against the Government printing return envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Wisconsin Laundrymen's Association, of Fond du Lac, Wis., relative to Chinese labor and competition; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of M. L. Boyce, of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the Menace being sent through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of International General Fishermen's Association, protesting against the passage of the Flood bill, relative to the kind of nets used by fishermen; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Stella B. Hatch and 360 others, in support of a law to protect calves and cattle from freezing in transit on the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Pana, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the twenty-first district of Illinois, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of citizens of Howell, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of Samuel W. Irwin, of East Greenwich, and Rev. P. A. Canada, of Barrington, R. I., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Petitions of citizens and church organizations of Freeport and other cities in the thirteenth Illinois district, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOON: Petition of citizens of Salt Creek, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURRAY: Petition of citizens of Coyle and Perkins, Okla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Christian Church of Nowata, Okla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Gideon A. Burgess, of the State of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: Petition of sundry citizens of Newark, N. J., protesting against the use of the mails by a publication called the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PROUTY: Petition of citizens of Dexter, Iowa, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of citizens of Slater, Polk City, Cambridge, Maxwell, Collins, Sheldahl, Elkhart, Altoona, Bondurant, Pella, Mitchellville, Gilbert Station, Ames, Nevada, and Colo, in the State of Iowa, in favor of H. R. 5308, providing for regulation of mail-order concerns; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of 250 members of the First Baptist Church of New Market, and congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Perth Amboy, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany H. R. 9955, granting a pension to John B. Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of members of regiments serving in past Indian wars, relative to pensions for said survivors, etc.; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Western Association of Short Line Railroads, protesting against the passage of House bill 17042, changing the basis of mail transportation rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Norwegian-Danish Methodist Episcopal Church, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the Olivet congregation, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of William L. Hovis Co., Reliable Print Shop, and Classy Printing Co., all of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the printing of stamped envelopes by the Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Angel City Court, of Catholic Order of Foresters, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the passage of the Hamill bill—H. R. 5139; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: Petition of 30 citizens of Monroe, Nebr., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of sundry citizens and church organizations of the State of Kentucky, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

#### SENATE.

TUESDAY, December 15, 1914.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Thee that we may be possessed with the passion of eternity. The pressing duties of this little world and this little life bring us constantly to the thought of things that pertain to time. Within this sphere our whole duty lies, but in the upper range and reach of life are our aspiration and our destiny. Preserve us from that littleness of life that would keep us constantly with our eyes on this earth only. May not our appetites, starved small by the continual view and use of this world, rob us of our higher aspirations and the hopes that are eternal. Speak to us out of Thine own eternity that we may live the larger life. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.